

---

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

---

11-29-2019 9:00 AM

## Love, Sex, and the Noose: The Emotions of Sodomy in 18th-Century England

Frances H.I. Henry  
*The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor  
May, Allyson N.  
*The University of Western Ontario*

Graduate Program in History

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Doctor of Philosophy

© Frances H.I. Henry 2019

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [European History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Henry, Frances H.I., "Love, Sex, and the Noose: The Emotions of Sodomy in 18th-Century England" (2019).  
*Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 6736.  
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/6736>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact [wlsadmin@uwo.ca](mailto:wlsadmin@uwo.ca).

## Abstract

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was widely believed that men who desired other men were despicable, degraded, depraved, vicious, and incapable of humane and generous sentiments. This dissertation looks at how the emotional reactions of and towards sodomites in England between 1691 and 1828 shaped this perception. It does this by considering six sets of paired emotions: lust and disgust, love and hatred, hope and fear, gratitude and anger, joy and sadness, and pride and shame. It examines how changes in law, gender norms, in religious and philosophical thought, the rise of sentimentalism, evangelism, nationalism and the middle-class shaped these emotional reactions. This dissertation does so through an interdisciplinary framework, with secondary sources from literature, philosophy, religion, gender studies, sociology, law and psychology. The first chapter shows how understandings of desire became tied to understandings of nature and reason, and so some types of lust lost much of the moral disapproval that they once carried, while the ‘unnatural’ became the target of moral disgust. Moral disgust was expressed by associating the act of sodomy and the body of the sodomite with objects of revulsion. Similarly, this re-framing of desire also rooted love in marriage and domesticity. This same process was used to justify hatred and violence towards sodomites. The third chapter considers the emotions of hope, fear, gratitude and anger. Fear of sodomites was used to justify anger against them; living in constant fear made hope difficult, leading to sadness and despair; sodomy was also held out as ungrateful to women and to God. Sentimentalism and evangelism led to the conflation of happiness to the domestic, and to the presence and influence of women. This prevented sodomites from ever being truly happy. Melancholy allowed elite sodomites to express, as grief, love for other

men that would otherwise be socially impossible. Finally, the shame created and enforced through disgust, hatred and disgrace became internalized by the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, literature, history, and famous examples provided a space, increasingly silenced, for some sodomites to have a sense of history and feel pride in themselves.

## Summary for Lay Audience

At the end of the 19th century, it was widely believed that men who desired other men were despicable, degraded, depraved, vicious, and incapable of humane and generous sentiments. This dissertation looks at how the emotional reactions of and towards sodomites in England between 1691 and 1828 shaped this perception. It does this by considering six sets of paired emotions: lust and disgust, love and hatred, hope and fear, gratitude and anger, joy and sadness, and pride and shame. It examines how changes in law, gender norms, in religious and philosophical thought, the rise of sentimentalism, evangelism, nationalism and the middle-class shaped these emotional reactions. This dissertation does so through an interdisciplinary framework, with secondary sources from literature, philosophy, religion, gender studies, sociology, law and psychology. The first chapter shows how understandings of desire became tied to understandings of nature and reason, and so some types of lust lost much of the moral disapproval that they once carried, while the ‘unnatural’ became the target of moral disgust. Moral disgust was expressed by associating the act of sodomy and the body of the sodomite with objects of revulsion. Similarly, this reframing of desire also rooted love in marriage and domesticity. This same process was used to justify hatred and violence towards sodomites. The third chapter considers the emotions of hope, fear, gratitude and anger. Fear of sodomites was used to justify anger against them; living in constant fear made hope difficult, leading to sadness and despair; sodomy was also held out as ungrateful to

women and to God. Sentimentalism and evangelism led to the conflation of happiness to the domestic, and to the presence and influence of women. This prevented sodomites from ever being truly happy. Melancholy allowed elite sodomites to express, as grief, love for other men that would otherwise be socially impossible. Finally, the shame created and enforced through disgust, hatred and disgrace became internalized by the 19th century. However, literature, history, and famous examples provided a space, increasingly silenced, for some sodomites to have a sense of history and feel pride in themselves.

## Keywords

Emotions, Sodomy, History, Masculinity, 18<sup>th</sup> Century, Molly Houses, Lust, Disgust, Love, Hatred, Hope, Fear, Gratitude, Anger, Joy, Sadness, Shame, Pride, England, Great Britain, Class, Royal Navy, Philosophy, Evangelism, Nationalism, Homosexuality.

## Acknowledgments

If it takes a village to raise a child, finishing a dissertation requires nearly as many people. I would like to thank my wife, Anna, who has been an unbelievable source of emotional and logistic support. I am also grateful to my parents, Walter and Joan, and my mother-in-law, Nancy, who provided encouragement, additional financial support, and constant cheerleading.

I would like to thank my Supervisor, Dr. Allyson N. May, and my second reader, Dr. Amy Bell of Huron College, Western University. Thank you for your insightful comments, patient reading of multiple drafts, and helpful criticisms. I would also like to thank Dr. Jonathan Vance for sharing his subscription to the British Newspaper Archive. I am also grateful to the members of the Department of History at Western University, including the late Dr. Brock Millman, whose thoughtful questions at the proposal stage helped shape the direction of the subsequent research. He will be greatly missed. Kara Brown and other members of the Department staff helped considerably with deadlines, bureaucracy, and the red tape of academia: thank you for all your support!

Thank you to the wonderful librarians and archivists at the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the Bristol Record Office, the British Library, Cambridge University Library and the National Archives, who helped me locate files, fetched books and boxes, and made materials available online. A big shout-out to Liz Mantz at Western University Library, who ordered books and subscribed to databases to further facilitate my research.

I would also like to thank the members of my examination committee (in addition to Dr. Bell), whose thoughtful comments and critical insights have been incorporated into the final version of this thesis: Dr. Nancy Rhoden of Western's History Department, Dr. Joel Faflak, Western's Department of English, and Dr. Brian Lewis of McGill University.

Finally, thank you to the Social Science and Humanities Research Council, the Government of Ontario, and the estates of Kenneth Hilborn and Ivie Cornish, whose financial support has been crucial to this project.

## Table of Contents

### Contents

Abstract .....	i
Summary for Lay Audience .....	ii
Acknowledgments .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	vi
Introduction .....	1
Terms, Scope and Sources .....	2
Historiography .....	6
History of the History of Sodomy .....	7
History of Emotions .....	12
Sodomy in the 18 <sup>th</sup> Century .....	21
Understanding the Emotions in 18 <sup>th</sup> -Century Britain .....	32
Social and Political Context .....	36
Chapter Summaries .....	42
Chapter 1 .....	45
Lust and Disgust .....	45
Lust, Disgust, and the Academy .....	46
Lust and Disgust in 18 <sup>th</sup> -Century Thought .....	51
Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy .....	57
Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy Among the Elite .....	58
Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy: The Middling Sorts .....	71
Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy: The Poor .....	85

Conclusion .....	97
Chapter 2.....	99
Love and Hatred.....	99
Love, Hatred and the Academy.....	101
Love and Hatred in 18 <sup>th</sup> -Century Thought.....	106
Love, Hatred and Sodomy.....	112
Love and Hate among the Elite.....	113
Love, Hate and Sodomy: The Middling Sorts .....	125
Love, Hatred and Sodomy: The Poor. ....	138
Conclusion .....	149
Chapter 3.....	151
Hope and Fear / Gratitude and Anger.....	151
Hope and Fear, Gratitude and Anger: The Academy.....	152
Hope and Fear, Gratitude and Anger in 18 <sup>th</sup> -Century Thought .....	156
Hope, Fear and Sodomy.....	162
Hope, Fear, and Sodomy among the Elite .....	163
Hope, Fear, and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts.....	169
Hope, Fear and Sodomy among the Poor. ....	174
Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy .....	177
Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy in Elite Circles .....	179
Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts .....	187
Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy: The Poor. ....	191
Conclusion .....	200
Chapter 4.....	202
Joy and Sadness .....	202



Joy, Sadness, and the Academy .....	204
Joy and Sadness in 18 <sup>th</sup> -Century Thought.....	209
Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy. ....	216
Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy in Elite Circles. ....	217
Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy: The Middling Sorts.....	229
Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy: The Poor. ....	242
Conclusion. ....	256
Chapter 5 .....	257
Shame and Pride .....	257
Shame, Pride and the Academy .....	259
Shame and Pride in 18 <sup>th</sup> -Century Thought.....	261
Pride, Shame and Sodomy .....	268
Shame, Pride and Sodomy in Elite Circles .....	270
Shame and Pride among the Middling Sorts.....	285
Pride, Shame and Sodomy Among the Poor.....	301
Conclusion .....	312
Conclusion .....	313
Bibliography .....	326
Curriculum Vitae .....	63

## Introduction

Describing British society in the last decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, John Addington Symonds (1840-1893) wrote that “it is the common belief that a male who loves his own sex must be despicable, degraded, depraved, vicious, and incapable of humane or generous sentiments.”<sup>1</sup>

How did this ‘common belief’ come about? How did the people of Britain come to see the “good” emotions - love, hope, gratitude, happiness, sympathy - as ones to which men attracted to other men could not feel?

This thesis argues that the answer lies in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. Historians have long recognized that there was a large shift from the sodomite of the late medieval and early modern period, who was defined by sexual acts, from the homosexual (and his cousins, the invert and the Uranian)<sup>2</sup> of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to mid-20<sup>th</sup> century who were understood as having a female or male psyche in the body of the opposite sex, and gay and bisexual men today, whose sexuality is part of natural sexual diversity. Similarly, both the Enlightenment and, later, the emergence of the new, scientific, discipline of psychology, forever changed how the Western world understood emotions. Where there were once sodomites, our world

---

<sup>1</sup> John Addington Symonds, *Male Love: A Problem in Greek Ethics and Other Writings*, ed. John Lauritsen (New York: Pagan Press, 1983), 88. This work was originally published in 1891. I am grateful to Paul Kelleher for the citation and reference.

<sup>2</sup> These terms were among the more popular of terms suggested by sexologists to classify men who were attracted sexually to other men. ‘Uranian’, originally referring to ‘a female psyche in a male body’, was popularized by activist Karl Heinrich Ulrichs in 1865, deriving the term from the Greek Goddess Aphrodite Urania, who was created out of the god Uranus’ testicles. He used the term Dionian (from Aphrodite Dionea) to refer to those attracted to people of the opposite sex. The term was popular among advocates for greater tolerance in Britain in the Victorian era, including Symonds and Oscar Wilde. A few years after Ulrichs, Hungarian Karoly Maria Kertbeny coined the terms homosexual and heterosexual. Richard von Krafft-Ebing in 1886 popularized the term ‘sexual inversion’, or an inborn reversal of gender traits. The term ‘bisexual’, now used to describe a person sexually attracted to both men and women, was coined in the early twentieth century to refer to men (or women) with the mind of the opposite sex.

now has gays; where there were once sentiments and passions, there are now emotions. The change is more than just semantics, the vocabulary highlights a huge gulf in ideas, understanding, and worldview. This thesis will investigate the multi-variant emotions that emerged when British men and women of the 18<sup>th</sup> century considered sodomy, and how, through theological, philosophical, and literary discourse, the character of the sodomite gradually became divorced from any positive emotion.

## Terms, Scope and Sources

What was considered sodomy? Michel Foucault, in his monumental *History of Sexuality*, called sodomy an “utterly confused category.”<sup>3</sup> He observes that pre-modern sodomy refers to a whole host of sexual activities and behaviours, only some of which map onto modern understandings of homosexuality. The Henrician Buggery Act (1533) included several sexual acts considered to be ‘against nature’, including anal sex between men, but also bestiality committed by both men and women, and anal sex between men and women. In some cases, sex with a pre-pubescent girl was also prosecuted as sodomy. This thesis is limited to acts of sexual behaviour occurring between male same-sex partners; bestiality, and (before 1730), opposite sex sodomy are excluded.<sup>4</sup> As well, while the English courts had specific legal

---

<sup>3</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert J Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1990), 101.

<sup>4</sup> This limitation is in keeping with most historical research on this topic; while this makes sense in terms of modern understandings of sexuality (and the fact that research on this topic began as a search for the historical roots of modern gay identity), whether this distinction is ahistorical is a question worth asking. A historical precedent for considering sodomy between men and bestiality as different crimes can be found in John Disney, *A View of Ancient Laws, against Immorality and Profaneness* (Cambridge: Printed for Corn. Cornfield, Printer to the University, 1729), 180. For the changes in how anal penetration between members of the opposite sex was prosecuted, see below.

definitions of sodomy and sodomitical assault, British society frequently identified behavior as sodomitical which did not involve sex. As this thesis is concerned with emotions, it also considers romantic relationships between men in which sex may not have been involved, but which were frequently read as sodomitical by 18<sup>th</sup>-century society.

My chosen time frame roughly coincides with the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. I begin not in 1688 with the Glorious Revolution, but with the foundation of the Society for the Reformation of Manners (SRM) in 1691. This date is significant because, while sodomy had been a capital crime since the 1530s, the law was rarely enforced.<sup>5</sup> The foundation of the SRM led to active attempts to stamp out all manner of urban vices, including deliberate actions to detect sodomites and bring them to justice. While they mainly focused on prostitution, drinking and gambling, the society played an active role in many of the earliest prosecutions of sodomites in London, and helped spread awareness of sodomy as an active threat. Likewise, the end-date for this study is also close, but not identical to the usual end of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. Instead of ending with the passage of the Reform Act in 1832, it uses July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1828 – when the Buggery Act was replaced by the Offenses against the Person Act. While sodomy would remain a capital crime until 1861, the new act was sufficiently different to make legal comparisons difficult.

In terms of geography, my thesis includes all areas subject to English Common Law: England and Wales, the ships and ports of the British Royal Navy, and the garrisons of the

---

<sup>5</sup> This transition from the patterns of prosecution in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries to that of the 18<sup>th</sup>, is described in Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1982).

Army. It does not include Scotland and Ireland, as these had their own law codes, and their own established legal system. It does not extend to the civilian government of British colonies and territories overseas, as they too had their own systems of law and government. Military courts martial are considered in this study, as military law was considered a subset of the common law, one which was only in operation in certain circumstances, rather than as a distinct law code of its own. While the cases considered are English ones, the attitudes and emotions surveyed are British – Scottish and Irish reactions to cases occurring in England are considered, as well as English reactions to Scottish and Irish cases (though the cases themselves are not).

With only a few exceptions, the sources on sodomites and their lives are largely made, and conscribed by hostile forces, which judged them through a lens of deviance and sin. This not only played a role in shaping a broader perception that sodomites were incapable of humane feeling; it also poses a challenge for historians, forcing us to read between the lines, and make some intuitive guesses as to positive interpretations of behavior and expressions filtered through a negative lens. My sources include trial transcripts, government correspondence, prison records, confessions; printed sermons and newspapers, personal correspondence and journals, and literary works such as satire, comedy, novels and poetry.

In this thesis, I have attempted, where possible, to include the voices of the sodomites themselves. This is easier for the 18<sup>th</sup>-century trials, where a combined desire to educate, by having the words and experiences of the convict serve as a warning and example to anyone who could possibly be on the same path; and to entertain, by providing exotic and titillating subject matter for the reading public, led to these voices being recorded. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century,

directly at the time when prosecutions for sodomy were increasing,<sup>6</sup> there was a rapidly descending curtain of silence.<sup>7</sup> This was largely due to the professionalizing courtroom, which began to rely on lawyers, rather than having the burden of proof fall on the accused. However, as Cocks identifies, there was an intentional determination on the part of civic authorities to suppress public knowledge and awareness of sodomy.<sup>8</sup> This silencing in the courtroom is balanced by the greater survival of other sources, such as journals, and correspondence, which provide glimpses into the emotional life of sodomites.

Each of the chapters that follow considers different responses to sodomy among three emotional communities: elites, middling sorts, and the poor.<sup>9</sup> However, the primary sources which are available vary greatly. For the elites, many of the sources are letters, poetry, journals and diaries. The advantages of these types of sources is that they are written by the subjects themselves, and voluntarily, rather than under the duress of a trial, and the subject matter more naturally deals with emotion. It is also much easier to place sodomitical events within the context of their lives. There are biographies written by friends; and sometimes even autobiographies. There are many volumes of published correspondence. For the poor, there are very few sources beyond documents of an incident or trial – they often disappear

---

<sup>6</sup> A. D. Harvey, "Prosecutions for Sodomy in England at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century," *The Historical Journal* 21, no. 4 (1978): 939–48. Harvey argues that prosecutions for sodomy, at least in London and Middlesex, increased more than tenfold after 1805.

<sup>7</sup> Harry Cocks, "Making the Sodomite Speak: Voices of the Accused in English Sodomy Trials, c.1800–98," *Gender & History* 18, no. 1 (2006): 88, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0424.2006.00416.x>.

<sup>8</sup> Harry Cocks, "Safeguarding Civility: Sodomy, Class and Moral Reform in Early Nineteenth-Century England," *Past & Present* 190, no. 1 (March 13, 2006): 143.

<sup>9</sup> The reasons for this will be discussed in section 1.4 below.

from the historical record after the completion of their punishment. Sources such as signed confessions or information given to the police, testimony or defense given at a trial, and petitions for royal mercy, while they purport to be the words of the sodomites, are still filtered through others (clerks, magistrates), and are compelled speech. As well, while the legal context still allows for the discovery of some emotions (fear, anger, grief), the focus of the discussion is on physical actions, rather than their emotional significance. The middling sorts have a mixture of all the above sources (though in smaller numbers). All three communities are discussed in newspaper reports, which, while often exaggerated (or minimized), provide details of emotional reactions (whether actual or desired) of the larger community.

While drawing primarily on the archival and printed primary sources which are the hallmarks of historical analysis, it will also draw from secondary works and research from diverse fields, such as psychology, philosophy, gender and sexuality studies, literature, sociology, cultural anthropology, and theology. In doing so, this thesis will seek to insert a missing piece in two historiographical puzzles. First, it will attempt to focus on the emotional lives and experiences of 18<sup>th</sup>-century sodomites, rather than on their sexual activities. Second, it will deepen our understanding of the social and cultural functions of emotions over a hundred-and-forty-year period, in all their confusing complexity.

## Historiography

While this thesis is unique in its scope and outlook, it draws on two established historiographies – the history of sodomy and the history of emotions. Historical studies of sodomy emerged in the mid-1970s and early 80s; and while historical research on the self is

as old as the history of the discipline itself, and emotions have made up an important part of research on various aspects of social history, the history of emotions as a subject worthy of examination on its own (rather than as a by-product of studies on sex, marriage, war, etc.) likewise began to emerge in the late 1970s.

In the wake of gender theorists and post-modern scholars' questioning of the 'essential' questions of gender and sexuality, changes emerged in the study of historical 'homosexuality'. Instead of gender and sexuality being a natural biological constant, which remained the same over the course of history (and thus, could be compared easily across space and time), social constructionists argued that both gender and sexuality were created by a sense of self operating within a given society. As a result, what it meant to be a woman in 16<sup>th</sup> century England was inherently different from what it would mean in 20<sup>th</sup> century America, or 9<sup>th</sup> century China. Similarly, historians drawing on the work of psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists, assumed that emotions were natural, biological responses to stimuli, and thus love was love, fear was fear, and hatred was hatred, regardless of the society in which that emotion was felt. Current trends in sociology, cultural anthropology and cognitive psychology increasingly recognize that culture can radically change the expression, stimuli, and social reaction to emotion, that emotions are not constant across space and time.

## History of the History of Sodomy

Writings on the history of sodomy have focused on a few areas: London (particularly the existence of a subculture revolving around molly houses), the military, the theatre, and aristocratic circles. London has been the focus of research due to its size (bigger than any other British city), and because of the greater survival of legal records and documents.



However, some scholars have attempted to broaden this base, including Polly Morris on Somerset, Harry Cocks on Lancashire, Steve Poole on Bristol, and George Rousseau on Oxford.<sup>10</sup> Many of these studies are limited in size and duration. Morris's work is limited by the small number of cases, albeit over a long period of time; Poole's study considers all of the sodomy cases in Bristol in a single decade (the 1730s); Rousseau discusses a single case (involving charges of sodomitical assault against an Oxford Don), and Harry Cocks looks at a handful of cases resulting from the discovery of a sodomitical club in rural Lancashire.

The bulk of research on sodomy in the 18<sup>th</sup> century revolves around the molly subculture in London. By far the most influential historian on this topic is Randolph Trumbach.<sup>11</sup> He identifies the molly subculture – which, in addition to providing (relatively) safe places for men who desired men to meet, also involved a few unique elements. Men in the molly subculture took on female names and identities, frequently cross-dressed, and used language heavily influenced by the street-language of local prostitutes. They would also sometimes mimic female rituals, such as marriage and childbirth.<sup>12</sup> Trumbach sees the mollies as the

---

<sup>10</sup> Polly Morris, "Sodomy and Male Honor: The Case of Somerset, 1740-1850," in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York: Harrington Park Press, 1989), 383–406; Cocks, "Safeguarding Civility"; Steve Poole, "'Bringing Great Shame upon This City': Sodomy, the Courts and the Civic Idiom in Eighteenth-Century Bristol," *Urban History* 34, no. 1 (2007): 114–26, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926807004385>; George Rousseau, "The Kiss of Death and Cabal of Dons: Blackmail and Grooming in Georgian Oxford," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 21, no. 4 (2008): 368–96, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6443.2008.00342.x>.

<sup>11</sup> Randolph Trumbach, "London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century," *Journal of Social History* 11, no. 1 (Fall 1977); Randolph Trumbach, "Sodomitical Assaults, Gender Role, and Sexual Development in Eighteenth-Century London," in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York: Harrington Park Press, 1989), 407–29; Randolph Trumbach, "Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2, no. 2 (1991): 186–203; Randolph Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

<sup>12</sup> Trumbach, "London's Sodomites."

male equivalent of female prostitutes and considers the construction of the sodomite as necessary to compensate for rapidly changing relationships between men and women.<sup>13</sup>

Much of the scholarship on the molly houses looks at the sub-culture from a gendered perspective. In addition to Trumbach's work, scholars such as Polly Morris, Richard Davenport-Hines, and A.D. Harvey have similarly focused on the gendered aspects of molly culture, and the ways in which fears of sodomy reflect anxieties about changing models of masculinity and femininity.<sup>14</sup> While other approaches to this issue are in the minority, there has been some consideration of the class aspects of the suppression of the molly houses. In two intriguing articles, Dennis Rubini and Steven Shapiro discuss the class aspects of the prosecution of sodomy in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>15</sup> Dennis Rubini argues that the concern about homosexuality in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century emerged as a result of anxieties about homosexual relationships at the Court – namely the relationships between William III and Anne and their respective favourites.<sup>16</sup> According to Rubini, disapproval of these relationships could only be

---

<sup>13</sup> Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*.

<sup>14</sup> Morris, "Sodomy and Male Honor: The Case of Somerset, 1740-1850"; Richard Davenport-Hines, *Sex, Death and Punishment: Attitudes to Sex and Sexuality in Britain since the Renaissance* (London: Collins, 1990); A. D. Harvey, *Sex in Georgian England: Attitudes and Prejudices from the 1720s to the 1820s* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994).

<sup>15</sup> Dennis Rubini, "Sexuality and Augustan England: Sodomy, Politics, Elite Circles and Society," in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York: Haworth Press, 1989), 349–82; Stephen Shapiro, "Of Mollies: Sex and Same-Sex Sexualities in the Eighteenth Century," in *In a Queer Place: Sexuality and Belonging in British and European Contexts*, ed. Kate Chedgzoy, Emma Francis, and Murray Pratt, Warwick Studies in the Humanities (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2002), 155–76.

<sup>16</sup> Of course, similar anxieties had surrounded the court of James I a century earlier, without any need to discover poor scapegoats. While Rubini does not address this issue, in my opinion, the difference lies in the political and social situation; a stronger press, the danger of Jacobite uprisings, and the existence of a molly subculture in which scapegoats could be found. See Chapter 5 for a discussion of the uses of the rumours surrounding James' court by 18<sup>th</sup>-century satirists.

safely expressed by making scapegoats of the members of the molly house sub-culture, who were part of the laboring poor. Shapiro, however, studies the ways in which the molly house culture was tied to working class neighbourhoods and cultures and argues that raids on the molly houses were part of the new middle-class attempt to control the sexuality of the laboring poor.<sup>17</sup>

Studies of military sodomy during this period have mainly considered the issue regarding the British Navy. Scholars include Arthur Gilbert, and more recently, B.R. Burg and Seth Stein LeJacq.<sup>18</sup> So far, the study of sodomy in the Army during this period is limited to a single article. Susan Gane uses personal journals to illustrate the nature of romantic friendship between two Methodist soldiers in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century British Army and demonstrates the often-treacherous boundaries between religious feeling and homosocial affect and institutionalized homophobia.<sup>19</sup>

Studies of sodomy in the theatre focus on the representation of the fop – was he meant to be read as a sodomite? Or merely effeminate and effete?<sup>20</sup> Largely the work of literary scholars

---

<sup>17</sup> Shapiro uses the terms ‘middling class’ and ‘middle class’ interchangeably, as well as ‘labouring class’. His time frame, the 1720s, is much earlier than is generally recognized for the emergence of the middle class.

<sup>18</sup> Arthur N. Gilbert, “The Africaine Courts-Martial: A Study of Buggery and the British Navy,” *Journal of Homosexuality* 1 (1974): 111–22; Arthur N. Gilbert, “Buggery and the British Navy: 1700-1861,” in *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*, ed. Wayne Dynes and Stephen Donaldson, Studies in Homosexuality 5 (New York: Garland Pub., 1992), 132–58; B. R. Burg, *Boys at Sea: Sodomy, Indecency, and Courts Martial in Nelson’s Navy* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Seth Stein LeJacq, “Buggery’s Travels: Royal Navy Sodomy on Ship and Shore in the Long Eighteenth Century,” *Journal for Maritime History* 17, no. 2 (2015): 103–16.

<sup>19</sup> Susan Gane, “Common Soldiers, Same-Sex Love and Religion in the Early Eighteenth-Century British Army,” *Gender & History* 25, no. 3 (2013): 637–51, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12033>.

<sup>20</sup> See in particular Laurence Senelick, “Mollies or Men of Mode? Sodomy and the Eighteenth-Century London Stage,” in *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*, ed. Wayne Dynes and Stephen Donaldson, Studies in Homosexuality 5 (New York: Garland Pub., 1992), 287–322; Phillip Carter, “Men About Town:

such as Terry Castle, Lawrence Senelick and Thomas King, readings of sodomy in plays and their interpretation by their intended audience involves close textual readings of the plays themselves, production notes, diary entries and letters describing performances, artists' representations of actors playing roles, and satirical ballads and broadsides.<sup>21</sup> Some historians, particularly Trumbach, have argued that these theatrical archetypes showed an elite or broadly popular awareness of the molly subculture. Shapiro and Carter, however, argue that, rather than reflecting the mollies, the character of the fop reflected concerns about changes in elite culture: changing standards of masculinity and consumerism.

The debate between essentialist and social constructionist understandings of homosexuality continues to be an issue, even in recent works in this field. While most scholars now subscribe to a social constructionist model which understands same-sex desire to be constructed and understood differently depending on historical and social context, several key authors tend to perceive sodomy as part of an essentialist understanding of homosexuality. Two of the main monographs exclusively looking at homosexuality in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Rictor Norton's *Mother Clap's Molly House*, and Netta Goldsmith's *The Worst of Crimes: Homosexuality and the Law in 18<sup>th</sup> Century London*, take an essentialist view of sexual relationships between men during this period. Both Norton and Goldsmith assume the

---

Representations of Foppery and Masculinity in Early Eighteenth-Century Urban Society," in *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*, ed. Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (London: Longman, 1997), 31–57.

<sup>21</sup> Terry Castle, "The Culture of Travesty: Sexuality and Masquerade in Eighteenth Century England," in *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*, ed. George Rousseau and Roy Porter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), 156–80; Senelick, "Mollies or Men of Mode? Sodomy and the Eighteenth-Century London Stage"; Thomas Alan King, *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).

existence of a homosexual identity; Norton even identifies it as a ‘gay’ identity, which has many of the qualities of the modern homosexual identity.

## History of Emotions

The conflict between essentialist and social constructionist understandings has also shaped the evolution of the study of emotions as historical subjects. Until recently, most historians have considered emotions to be natural, biological aspects of human life; like gender and sexuality, they were considered constant and fixed. This has begun to change in recent decades, reflecting changes in how emotions are understood in other disciplines. However, as Thomas Dixon and others point out<sup>22</sup>, this view of the emotions – as involuntary, bodily reactions to external stimuli, is a product of the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. Prior to this, emotions (referred to in various terms, as passions, sentiments, feelings, impressions) were in the soul, and were thus the realm of theology as much as philosophy or natural science.

Cultural anthropologists, as well as psychologists from non-Western cultures, have increasingly argued that emotions are shaped by cultural expectations. For example, anthropologist Catherine Lutz found that in Iftaluk, a Pacific Atoll, emotions are considered primarily of moral and political importance, and thus are related to social position and authority.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Kitayama *et al.* point out that, while pride is considered a positive

---

<sup>22</sup> Thomas Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 14. An intriguing entry in this debate can also be found in Monique Scheer, “Topographies of Emotion,” in *Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Emotions*, ed. Ute Frevert et al., trans. Keith Tribe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 32–61.

<sup>23</sup> Catherine Lutz, *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll & Their Challenge to Western Theory*, 1988.

emotion in the West, in Japan, which largely considers emotion through the lens of dependence/independence, pride is a ‘bad’ emotion.<sup>24</sup> As will be discussed further, in the chapter on Pride and Shame, 18<sup>th</sup>-century Britons tended to consider pride a ‘bad’ emotion, and shame a positive one – the reverse of modern Western expectations. This is because emotions were considered through a Christian lens and related to behaviours. Shame was ‘good’ because it led to virtues such as humility, modesty and chastity; pride was one of the seven deadly sins of humankind.

Since the historical study of emotions began to emerge as a sub-field in the mid-1980s, scholarship has largely conformed to one of several broad trends. Many works either examine a single emotion over a long time-period (typically at least a century),<sup>25</sup> or study the interplay of two or more emotions over a short period of time (such as a single year, or at most a few decades).<sup>26</sup> Two other dominant strands in historical writing on emotions are

---

<sup>24</sup>Shinobu Kitayama, Hazel Rose Markus, and Hisaya Matsumoto, “Culture, Self and Emotion: A Cultural Perspective on ‘Self-Conscious’ Emotions,” in *Self-Conscious Emotions: The Psychology of Shame, Guilt, Embarrassment and Pride*, ed. June P. Tangney and Kurt W. Fischer (New York: Guilford Press, 1995), 439–64.

<sup>25</sup> Historians following this approach include Carol Zisowitz Stearns and Peter N Stearns, *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America’s History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Peter N Stearns, *Jealousy: The Evolution of an Emotion in American History* (New York: University Press, 1989); Maureen Flynn, “Blasphemy and the Play of Anger in Sixteenth-Century Spain,” *Past and Present* 149, no. 1 (1995): 29–56; Barbara H Rosenwein, ed., *Anger’s Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998); Susan J Matt, *Keeping up with the Joneses: Envy in American Consumer Society, 1890-1930* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003); William Vernon Harris, *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2004); Joanna Bourke, *Fear: A Cultural History* (Emeryville, CA: Avalon Pub., 2006); David Nash and Anne-Marie Kilday, *Cultures of Shame: Exploring Crime and Morality in Britain 1600-1900* (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Simon May, *Love: A History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012); Laurel Fulkerson, *No Regrets: Remorse in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Chris Walsh, *Cowardice: A Brief History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2014).

<sup>26</sup> Some examples of this include Alain Corbin, *The Village of Cannibals: Rage and Murder in France, 1870*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1992); William M Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001),

intellectual history – either of philosophy or science - and methodological studies, which appeal for a broader consideration of the field, suggest frameworks for understanding historical emotions, and attempt to synthesize research on emotions from a number of fields, including psychology, anthropology, sociology, literature, philosophy, and (more recently), neuroscience.<sup>27</sup>

While emotions played a critical role in the study of *mentalités* in French historiography of the 1940s and 50s (and continue to do so to this day), they were much slower to be incorporated into English language historiography. In the mid-70s, socio-cultural historians tried to integrate emotions with socio-economic history, through the study of rituals, popular protest, and social institutions (such as marriage and family). One key example is Lawrence Stone's study of the family in early modern England. Using diaries and letters, as well as parish records (wills, birth and death certificates, marriage certificates), Stone came to the surprising conclusion that early modern parents did not love their children to the same degree as did parents from the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century onwards.<sup>28</sup> As Peter and Carol Stearns point out,

---

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511512001>; Martha Tomhave Blauvelt, "The Work of the Heart: Emotion in the 1805-1835 Diary of Sarah Connell Ayer," *Journal of Social History* 35, no. 3 (2002): 577–92, <https://doi.org/10.1353/jsh.2002.0003>; Emily Rodman, "The Heart in the Archives: Colonial Contestation of Desire and Fear in the New Hebrides, 1933," *Journal of Pacific History* 38, no. 3 (2003): 291–312; Michael Roper, "Between Manliness and Masculinity: The 'War Generation' and the Psychology of Fear in Britain, 1914-1950," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 343–62, <https://doi.org/10.1086/427130>; Frank Biess, "'Everybody Has a Chance': Nuclear Angst, Civil Defence, and the History of Emotions in Postwar West Germany," *German History* 27, no. 2 (2009): 215–43.

<sup>27</sup> Works which attempt this include Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards," *The American Historical Review* 90, no. 4 (1985): 813–36, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1858841>; Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling*; Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 2006); Jan Plamper, *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*, trans. Keith Tribe, First edition, Emotions in History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

<sup>28</sup> Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977).

demography has provided tools to study the history of emotions. They point to the historical commonplace, that there is a connection between the lowering of the infant death rate and the increase of parental investment in children.<sup>29</sup> Family history in many ways was one of the first to bring emotions into history as a key element; particularly love, anger, and fear.<sup>30</sup> In the 1980s, as social history spread beyond studies of the family and marriage into those of gender, of race, of sex, emotion was frequently an unexamined factor in these studies. For example, in Davidoff and Hall's *Family Fortunes*, both emotion and economics play critical roles in the creation of modern gender roles and the establishing of separate spheres.<sup>31</sup>

In the late 80s, emotions began to take center stage, as Peter and Carol Stearns attempted to create a framework to consider emotions historically. Identifying some of the critical barriers in the study of emotional change over time, they proposed 'emotionology' to help historians distinguish between "the collective emotional standards of a society" from those of individuals.<sup>32</sup> Over the next two decades, the Stearnses, separately and together, published a number of monographs on emotions in American history.<sup>33</sup> For the Stearnses, there was a critical breakthrough in the history of emotional norms with the onset of modernity in 1600.

---

<sup>29</sup> Stearns and Stearns, "Emotionology," 818.

<sup>30</sup> John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth; Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).; Edward Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (New York: Basic Books, 1975). These are discussed in connection within the broader context of the study of emotions in history in Stearns and Stearns, "Emotionology," 818.

<sup>31</sup> Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (London: Hutchinson, 1987).

<sup>32</sup> Stearns and Stearns, "Emotionology," 813.

<sup>33</sup> Stearns and Stearns, *Anger*.; Stearns, *Jealousy*.; Peter N. Stearns, *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style*, History of Emotion Series 3 (New York: New York University Press, 1994).; Peter N. Stearns, *American Fear: The Causes and Consequences of High Anxiety* (New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis, 2006).



Medievalists such as Barbara Rosenwein have criticized this chronology, calling 1600 an “illusory watershed.”<sup>34</sup> Rosenwein, whose own contribution to the historiography will be discussed below, also criticizes the Stearnses for their over-reliance on modern advice and etiquette manuals in order to determine non-elite emotional norms. Ultimately, despite the academic influence of the Stearnses, the history of emotions in the 1980s and 1990s did not see the breakthrough experienced by other historiographical trends during this period.

The mid-90s, however, saw a shift in American understanding of the history of emotions away from social relativism, and towards an essentialism influenced by the life sciences.<sup>35</sup> Particularly important in this trend was William M. Reddy, an American anthropologist and historian of 18<sup>th</sup> century France. He drew ideas from the life sciences as a means of understanding emotions historically.<sup>36</sup> Reddy argues that the constructivist approach, drawn particularly from anthropology, obstructs the creation of any sense of the normative and creates a barrier to judging the evolution of emotions over time. In his article, ‘Against Constructivism’, Reddy argues for a balance between universalism and constructivism by translating John Austin’s theory of speech acts: universalism is constative, “the fir branch is green”, and social constructivism is performative, like saying “I do,” in front of a priest. Reddy’s position is that a person’s statements about emotions contain both constative and

---

<sup>34</sup> Barbara H. Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions in History,” *The American Historical Review* 107, no. 3 (2002): 826, <https://doi.org/10.1086/532498>.

<sup>35</sup> Plamper, *The History of Emotions*, 59. Plamper dedicates an entire section of Chapter 4 to Reddy, his ideas, and his influence on the field, in which he argues against the turn to the unquestioning use of results from the life sciences in historical writing.

<sup>36</sup> William M. Reddy, “Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions,” *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (1997): 327–51, <https://doi.org/10.1086/204622>; Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling*.

performative elements. “I am sad” is both descriptive of a situation (constative) and involves the deliberate intensification of one emotional state over others. When one is presented with a tragedy, many emotions occur in reaction – sadness, anger, despair, guilt, sometimes even relief; in stating “I am sad”, the person is choosing sadness from among the various reactions, and in this way the statement is performative – it intensifies sadness and diminishes anger, despair and relief.<sup>37</sup>

Reddy calls these ‘emotives’: statements which both describe and shape the emotions which inspire them. The criticism of his framework, beyond a disagreement about the universal acceptance of social constructivism within contemporary anthropological research, focused on its failure to deal with the relationship between emotional statements and memory. Statements describing the emotional reactions of people at a trial written 30 years after the fact are not the same as the emotions the actors would have had at the time.<sup>38</sup> As well, Lutz accuses Reddy of failing to consider how the laboratory work on which his analysis is based is socially constructed, and warns against using scientific theories uncritically when describing other cultures, or groups of people in the past.<sup>39</sup> While these criticisms must be kept in mind, they do not invalidate Reddy’s basic argument: while emotional reactions are biological, and so universal, the process of expressing them, or even contemplating them, is fundamentally shaped by the culture and emotional norms of the society in which they occur.

---

<sup>37</sup> Reddy, “Against Constructionism,” 330.

<sup>38</sup> Linda C. Garro, “Comment on William M. Reddy, Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions,” *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (1997): 342.

<sup>39</sup> Catherine Lutz, “Comment on William M. Reddy, Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions,” *Current Anthropology* 38, no. 3 (1997): 345.

Reddy expands on this in *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, published in 2001. The first half of the book is devoted to surveying the recent literature in anthropology and psychology, and in describing his own theory of emotion which attempts to combine these very different academic fields. In the second part of the book, Reddy tests his theory by using it in an analysis of the role of emotions in the French Revolution.<sup>40</sup> In so doing, his concept of emotives becomes key: the rise of sentimentalism in French society led to an excessive use of emotional language, creating an emotional overheating of society. This in turn led to the Terror, and the horrific deaths of so many people. This surfeit of feelings and doubts led to such emotional suffering that it could only lead to the end of the “sentimentalist emotional regime.”<sup>41</sup>

Reddy’s work is of huge theoretical importance, but so is that of Barbara Rosenwein. She finds Reddy’s theory of emotives is too logocentric. She queries whether unspoken thoughts work the same as spoken declarations of feeling, and what of physical reactions and gestures? Even in cases where it is spoken, does the context and audience to whom the expression is made influence a feedback mechanism of the emotive?<sup>42</sup> Surely it must. Rosenwein also expresses concern about the close relationship Reddy draws between the emotional and political regimes, claiming that he seems to consider the typical political regime the modern nation state. She points out that this is a modern invention, and one that

---

<sup>40</sup> Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling*.

<sup>41</sup> Reddy, 326.

<sup>42</sup> Barbara H Rosenwein, “Review of William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*,” *American Historical Review* 107, no. 4 (2002): 1182. Her concerns are also discussed in Plamper, *The History of Emotions*, 261–62.

has not been typical for most eras of human history. Even in centralized states, however, the historical person was part of several communities, not just a political one.<sup>43</sup>

Contemporaneous with her review of Reddy's work, Rosenwein published an important article synthesizing the current state of historical research on the history of emotions. In it, she is critical of the 'grand narrative' of increasing emotional restraint, which assumes that emotional control emerged only in the early modern period. Rosenwein sees this grand narrative as being based on what she calls the 'hydraulic' model of emotions. In this model "the emotions are like great liquids within each person, heaving and frothing, eager to be let out."<sup>44</sup> She traces the origins of this model to medieval medical conceptions of humors, which survive because of how the emotions feel as they are experienced.<sup>45</sup>

In both "Worrying about Emotions in History," and in her book, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, Rosenwein proposes a new way of thinking about the social foundation of emotion: something that she calls emotional communities. As with social communities, an individual belongs to several different emotional communities simultaneously and moves between them; and as with the social, the different emotional communities often had their own norms regarding the expression of feelings. Describing this situation graphically, she argues that emotional communities form

... a large circle within which there are smaller circles ... The large circle is the overarching emotional community, tied together by fundamental assumptions, values,

---

<sup>43</sup> Rosenwein, "Review of William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*," 1182.

<sup>44</sup> Rosenwein, "Worrying about Emotions in History," 834.

<sup>45</sup> Rosenwein, 836.

goals, feeling rules, and accepted modes of expression. The smaller circles represent subordinate emotional communities, partaking in the larger one and revealing its possibilities and its limitations. They too may be subdivided. At the same time, other large circles may exist, either entirely isolated from or intersecting with the first at one or more points.<sup>46</sup>

This dynamic explains the very different emotional reactions to public executions in the late 18th and early 19th century described by Vic Gatrell<sup>47</sup>; they were coming from different emotional communities. While all the people belonged to one overarching emotional community, 18th-century Britain, they were part of different subordinate communities and thus had different emotional reactions.

In subsequent work, Rosenwein has expanded on her concepts of emotional communities – these can be text based (either using modern mass media, or through letters between people who never meet)<sup>48</sup>, and can be large or small – they can be as small as a couple or a family, and as large as the whole world. Emotional norms also change within emotional communities, as well as differ between them.<sup>49</sup> According to Jan Plamper, Rosenwein’s framework comes closer than Reddy’s to being easily adapted to any culture and any time period.<sup>50</sup> However, both Reddy and Rosenwein’s frameworks have proved very useful for historians attempting to trace change and continuity in the history of emotions.

---

<sup>46</sup> Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, 24.

<sup>47</sup> Vic Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People, 1770-1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>48</sup> This concept was expressed by Rosenwein at a lecture given 6 July 2009 at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin. This distinction is discussed in Plamper, *The History of Emotions*, 69.

<sup>49</sup> Barbara H Rosenwein, “Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions,” *Passions in Context: International Journal for the History and Theory of Emotions* 1, no. 1 (2010): 24.

<sup>50</sup> Plamper, *The History of Emotions*, 69.

## Sodomy in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century

Important to understanding emotional reactions to sodomy in the 18<sup>th</sup> century is the recognition that it was a crime, as well as a religious sin. In England, it became a capital civil offence in 1533, with the *Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Buggery*. This law made a felony without benefit of Clergy ‘buggery committed with Mankind or Beast.’<sup>51</sup> The *Laws in Wales Act* of 1542 extended the Buggery law into Wales. It was briefly repealed under Mary I, but re-enacted in 1562 by Elizabeth I, as the *Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Sodomy*.<sup>52</sup> Under this law, which was used only a handful of times in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, sodomy consisted of anal penetration between two persons, or anal or vaginal sex between a human and an animal.

Over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, its application in common law became increasingly narrow. At least at the Old Bailey, it largely ceased to be applied to women involved in bestiality by the early 18<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>53</sup> and after the 1730s, heterosexual sodomy was not punished if consensual, and, if not, was dealt with as rape, not sodomy.<sup>54</sup> Female same-sex

---

<sup>51</sup> England and Wales. Parliament, “Henry VIII, 1533: An Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Buggery,” in *The Statutes at Large, of England and of Great Britain: From Magna Carta to the Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. John Raithby, vol. 3 (London: Printed by G. Eyre and A. Strahan, 1811), 145.

<sup>52</sup> England and Wales. Parliament., “Elizabeth I, 1562: An Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Sodomy,” in *The Statutes at Large, of England and of Great Britain*, ed. John Raithby, vol. 4, 20 vols. (London: Printed by G. Eyre and A. Strahan, 1811), 231–32.

<sup>53</sup> The *Old Bailey Proceedings Online* lists only two women prosecuted for sodomy, both for bestiality with a dog: an unnamed ‘married woman lately living without Cripple-gate’, in 1677 (t16770711-1), and Mary Price in 1704 (t17040426-42). All further bestiality cases are against men. Further work remains to be done as to whether this pattern of prosecution occurred in areas beyond London.

<sup>54</sup> Some justices did consider this to be sodomy. In *Rex v. Wiseman* (1716), Judge Fortescue ruled that ‘mankind’ included women in his judgement on a case where the crime had been committed on an 11-year old girl. *Rex v. Wiseman* (1716) 92 Eng. Rep. 91. However, as Gilbert points out, his insistence that it include women shows that this was not a decided conclusion, and men accused of sex with pre-pubescent girls were

relationships were not, in fact, illegal, or even considered to be sex (which was understood in a phallogentric fashion).<sup>55</sup> As with rape, proof of both penetration and emission was required for a successful conviction. While the statute did not make any allowances for consent, in practice victims of non-consensual sodomy were seldomly prosecuted. And while there was no legal age of consent, there was one in practice. As Sir Matthew Hale observed, “if buggery be committed upon a man of the age of discretion, both are felons ... But if with a man under the age of discretion, viz. fourteen years old, then the buggerer only is the felon.”<sup>56</sup> This point would become a key element of the discussion surrounding the conviction of Robert Jones in the 1770s. This act remained in effect until July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1828, when it was replaced by the Offences against the Person Act. This Act, also called ‘Lord Landsdowne’s Act’, consolidated or repealed many of the different offences against the ‘person’; including rape, sodomy, murder, abduction, bigamy, and assault. In sodomy trials, penetration without emission was deemed sufficient proof of guilt, closing one of the loopholes which had protected men under the previous law. It also encoded the crime of assault with intent to commit a felony, authorizing imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term of up to two years, even though men had been convicted for such things for over a century.

---

almost invariably charged with rape after 1730. Arthur N. Gilbert, “Sodomy and the Law in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *Societas* 8, no. 3 (1978): 226.

<sup>55</sup> For this reason, they did not create the legal documents which are the primary sources for historians; even where female same-sex sexuality is acknowledged, it is mainly pornographic, and not considered to be part of ‘sodomy’; as a result, this thesis does not engage with female same-sex relationships, as they were not considered sodomy.

<sup>56</sup> Sir Matthew Hale, *Historia Placitorum Coronæ: The History of the Pleas of the Crown* (Savoy: Printed by E. and R. Nutt, and R. Gosling for F. Gyles, 1736), 670.

In the military, sodomy and sodomitical actions were covered by two different articles of martial law. Interestingly, the 1652 *Laws of War* promulgated by the Commonwealth Parliament made no mention of either sodomy or buggery, though article 2 forbidding ‘uncleanness’ survived virtually unchanged in the Acts of 1661 and 1749. It forbade “unlawful and rash Oaths, Cursings, Execrations, Drunkenness, Uncleanness, and other scandalous acts in derogation of Gods Honor, and corruption of good Manners.”<sup>57</sup> In 1661, the *Laws of War* were re-enacted as *An Act for the Establishing Articles and Orders for the Regulating and Better Government of His Majesty’s Navies, Ships of War and Forces by Sea*. This act slightly revised the previous legislation, replacing references to the Commonwealth, and decreasing the number of articles from 39 to 35 (through combining several of the provisions). The Councils of War were replaced by Courts Martial, who were empowered to determine punishments in over a dozen of the revised articles. The punishment for violating the revised Article 2, for example, now included a fine and imprisonment, as well as whatever punishment the Courts Martial thought fit. While it continued to forbid cursing, etc., it was almost exclusively used for the prosecution of sodomitical offences. The greatest change (for the purposes of this dissertation, anyway), was in the ‘revised’ Article 32. This article had previously penalized sleeping at or abandoning one’s post; it was revised to forbid “the unnaturall and detestable sin of Buggery or Sodomy with Man or Beast” under “punishment of death without mercy.”<sup>58</sup> The Articles of War were further updated in 1749,

---

<sup>57</sup> England and Wales. Parliament., *Laws of War and Ordinances of the Sea: Ordained and Established by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England ... Saturday the 25th of December, 1652*. (London: Printed by John Field, printer to the Parliament of England, 1652), 3–4.

<sup>58</sup> Great Britain. Parliament., “Charles II, 1661: An Act for the Establishing Articles and Orders for the Regulateing and Better Government of His Majesties Navies Ships of Warr & Forces by Sea,” in *Statutes of the*



leaving the provision against sodomy largely unchanged. It was moved from Article 32 to Article 29, and the phrase ‘without mercy’ was removed from the punishment.<sup>59</sup>

The martial law allowed for an innovation in common law to account for men whose actions did not meet the legal definition of sodomy, but which were clearly sodomitical in nature and intent. Following the acquittal of George Duffus in 1722 for sodomy, a ‘special jury’ met, and determined that he was guilty of ‘assault with intent to commit sodomy.’<sup>60</sup> This would become one of the more common ways of punishing those against whom sodomy could not be proved. This could include a large variety of behaviours and activities, from lewd remarks, kissing, mutual masturbation, fellatio<sup>61</sup>, intercrural sex, and anal penetration without emission. Unlike sodomy, sodomitical assault was a misdemeanor, rather than a felony; as such, it was not capital, and punishments could vary wildly, but typically involved a fine (anywhere from 1s. to £1000, depending on the convicts’ means), shame punishments (this could include standing in the pillory once or several times, or being publicly whipped, with sentences of several hundred lashes being quite common), and time in prison (sentences

---

*Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*, ed. John Raithby (s.l: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819), 311–14, <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp311-314>.

<sup>59</sup> N. A. M. Rodger, ed., *Articles of War: The Statutes Which Governed Our Fighting Navies, 1661, 1749 and 1866* (Havant: Kenneth Mason, 1982).

<sup>60</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, December 1721, Trial of George Duffus (t17211206-20). Cf. Kieran McCarthy, “‘Peccatum Illud Horrible Christianos Non Nominandum’: The Prosecution of Homosexuality in English and Irish Law, 1533-1993,” *University College Dublin Law Review* 12, no. 1 (2012): 17.

<sup>61</sup> This was mainly considered a form of sodomitical assault, rather than sodomy, though this decision was not universal. In *Rex V. Jacobs* (1817), the accused was convicted of sodomy at the Warwick Lent Assizes for forcing a seven-year old boy to fellate him. “*R. v. Jacobs*.” 168 Eng. Rep. Russ. & Ry. 331. However, this case was later overturned, and it was ruled that this did not constitute sodomy. This distinction is discussed in Gilbert, “Sodomy and the Law in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Britain,” 226–27.

varied, but were usually 1-2 years). Prison sentences were often accompanied by hard labour or solitary confinement.

In the popular imagination, however, the ‘sodomite’ as a person was a much more fluid and flexible character. While the associations with witchcraft, heresy, atheism and treason began to disappear from popular conceptions of the sodomite over the course of the 18th century,<sup>62</sup> they never entirely vanished, but were subsumed as ideas of deviant sexuality developed and changed.<sup>63</sup> According to Alan Bray, there was a fundamental societal disconnect between the figure of the sodomite, a horrific, unnatural, detestable creature, and the members of ordinary society who happened to be sexually attracted to other men.<sup>64</sup> Again, over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, this disconnect gradually changed, so that sodomy (and the sodomite) became someone engaging in specific acts; acts that were increasingly being recognized as sodomitical, rather than merely aspects of male friendship. Via court cases, sermons, newspapers, and broadsheets, a wide range of acts and behaviours became associated with sodomy, and what had been an unremarkable aspect of friendship in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, had become sodomitical assault by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup>.

---

<sup>62</sup> For a description of how the sodomite was associated with these bug-bears of the early modern world, see Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England; The Friend* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). For a further discussion of the links between sodomy, heresy, and rebellion, see B. R. Burg, “Ho Hum, Another Work of the Devil: Buggery and Sodomy In Early Stuart England,” *Journal of Homosexuality* 6, no. 1–2 (January 22, 1981): 69–78, [https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v06n01\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v06n01_07); Cynthia B Herrup, *A House in Gross Disorder: Sex, Law, and the 2nd Earl of Castlehaven* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>63</sup> See David M Halperin, *How to Do the History of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 109.

<sup>64</sup> Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 79.

It is difficult to describe a typical sodomite: the men surveyed in this study involve a large cross-section of British society. They include peers of the realm, temporal and spiritual; merchants, doctors, lawyers, teachers and clerks; schoolboys and apprentices; soldiers, and sailors, officers and gentlemen; they occupied every profession and social position. They also showed a great deal of variation in terms of religion. While the vast majority are Church of England, there were a surprisingly large number of other faiths. Among those identified as non-Anglican in the sources, I have found 10 Catholics, 10 Nonconforming Protestants (5 Baptists, 2 Methodists, a Presbyterian, an Anabaptist, and a ‘Dissenter’), 5 Jews, and 3 Muslims. The actual numbers of non-Anglicans accused was likely higher, since even where faith is not identified, it can often be intuited from names or ethnicity. Frenchmen and Italians were likely Catholic, and David Solomon (committed at Worcester in 1809) was probably Jewish. Munnoo, an Indian, is identified as being attended at his execution by a ‘priest of his own country’, was probably Hindu, but possibly Sikh, Jain, or Muslim.<sup>65</sup> Given the rarity of sodomy as a crime, and the low percentage of these groups in English society, even a handful is significant. Also significant is the number of accused sodomites who were clergymen or preachers: Head, Poole, Percy Jocelyn, and Rev. Jephson are all identified as holding livings within the Church of England.<sup>66</sup> Louis Darnly and the Rev. Steward were

---

<sup>65</sup> *Norfolk Chronicle*, 31 Dec. 1814. He is identified as East Indian in the *Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, 26 Dec. 1814.

<sup>66</sup> Head was the Rector of Bardwell, Essex (*Pawlet v. Head*, 161 Eng. Rep. 2 Lee App. 565); Poole the Rector of Cheadle, Cheshire (*Manchester Mercury*, 6 Sept. 1768; SP 44/337 f. 331, TNA); Percy Jocelyn was the Bishop of Clogher in Ireland, but was indicted in London (Anonymous, “The Bishop!! Particulars of the Charge Against the Hon. Percy Jocelyn, Bishop of Clogher [1822],” in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850: Sodomy*, ed. Ian McCormick (London: Routledge, 2000), 347–68.; Rev. Thomas Jephson was a Doctor of Divinity, and a Fellow at St. John’s College, Cambridge (*A Report of the Trial of the Reverend Thomas Jephson, for a Misdemeanor, at the Cambridge Summer Assizes, 1823, on Wednesday, July 23, Before Mr. Serjeant Bosanquet, and a Common Jury*, 1823.).

Catholic priests, and Henry Crofton hoped to take holy orders in the Roman Catholic church.<sup>67</sup> Charles Bradbury and John Church were Baptist preachers,<sup>68</sup> and Joseph Studley a Methodist preacher.<sup>69</sup>

Did the men engaging in same-sex sexual behavior self-identify as sodomites? Certainly some did: as will be seen in later chapters, Norfolk tailor Robert Carlton made no fuss about his relationship with George Lincoln; London jeweller Samuel Drybutter publicly declared himself a sodomite, and William Beckford of Fonthill, father to the ninth Duchess of Hamilton, was all too aware of his difference. Most men, however, seem to retain the mental disconnect between the horrible, unnatural sodomite, and their own behavior, which might be sinful, but was no worse than other sorts of sin. Many men were careful never to cross the line between sodomitical practices (kissing, mutual masturbation, fellatio, intercrural sex) and the act of sodomy itself. This not only had the legal benefit of protecting them from the death penalty if discovered but allowed them to engage in their sexual desires without self-identifying as sodomites.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1804, trial of LOUIS DARNEY (t18040411-53); *The Times* 24 June 1823 identifies Rev. Frederick Steward as a Catholic Priest; Henry Ambrose Crofton was an Irishman, intending on going into Holy Orders (*Examiner* 14 Sept. 1823).

<sup>68</sup> Charles Bradbury, "Mr. Bradbury's Case Truly Stated [1755]," in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy.*, ed. Ian McCormick (London: Routledge, 2000), 27–89. John Church, *The Foundling; or, the Child of Providence* (London: Printed for the Author, and Sold at the Surrey Tabernacle., 1823).

<sup>69</sup> *The London Packet*, 6-9 April 1799 'corrected' Methodist preacher to 'idiot recently released from the Madhouse' – a correction not repeated in any of the other papers. *Lloyd's Evening Post* 3-5 April 1799, *London Packet* 3-5 April 1799; *Whitehall Evening Post* 4-6 April 1799; *Evening Mail* 5-8 April 1799; *London Packet* 5-8 April 1799.

A helpful concept which has emerged within psychology within the last few years is ‘romantic orientation’.<sup>70</sup> Romantic orientation is related, but not identical to sexual orientation – sexual orientation involves the object of sexual desire, and romantic orientation the object of romantic love. This allows for the separation of sexual desire and romantic love. George Rousseau’s concept of ‘homo-Platonic’, that is, romantic love for someone of the same sex that is deeply emotional but not necessarily sexual, aligns with a homoromantic orientation. Likewise, some men could engage only in same-sex sexual acts but be romantically involved with the opposite sex (heteroromantic). Using this model, Horace Walpole, who clearly fell in love with a series of men over the course of his life, but may have died a virgin,<sup>71</sup> can be considered as a sodomite, despite never engaging in the act of sodomy. It also allows for greater fluidity of emotional connection: men such as William Beckford, who loved his wife deeply and mourned her all his life, but was sexually attracted only to male youths, can be understood without denying the validity of either emotion.

Sociological research on homosexuality in various situations and cultures is careful to distinguish between congenital and situational homosexuality. The former considers those whose sexual orientation is towards those of the same sex; the latter considers those who do

---

<sup>70</sup> Lisa M. Diamond, “What Does Sexual Orientation Orient? A Biobehavioral Model Distinguishing Romantic Love and Sexual Desire,” *Psychological Review* 110, no. 1 (January 2003): 173–92, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.1.173>.

<sup>71</sup> This seems to be the conclusion of many of Walpole’s modern biographers and editors, including W.S. Lewis, who edited his voluminous correspondence. Others, such as Timothy Mowl, assume sexual behavior must exist due to the clear romantic desire expressed in his correspondence. George Haggerty argues that his sexual behavior is irrelevant and that it is the emotional connections which is of historical importance. For a historiographical overview of this topic, see George E. Haggerty, “Queering Horace Walpole,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46, no. 3 (2006): 543–62. Cf. Brian Fothergill, *The Strawberry Hill Set: Horace Walpole and His Circle* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983); Timothy Mowl, *Horace Walpole: The Great Outsider* (London: Murray, 1996).

not experience sexual or romantic attraction to a same-sex partner, but who engage in homosexual behavior for other reasons, such as the lack of available women (as in boarding schools, the navy, prison, etc). This is what Benjamin Kahan calls the ‘deprivation model’ of ‘situational’ or ‘acquired’ homosexuality. The model used most frequently in sexuality studies, it sees situational homosexuality as a “sexuality of last resort: growing out of geographic confinement or economic necessity.”<sup>72</sup> Kahan suggests two additional models, transformation and homosexual panic. Under the transformation model, the situation unlocks a desire; engaging in homosexual acts for economic or geographic reasons, the person becomes ‘addicted’ to homosexuality. The situation “effects a fundamental change of identity, reorganizing desire and pleasure and forestalling the first model’s easy movement across the homo/hetero divide.”<sup>73</sup> The third model, homosexual panic, refers to a psychological diagnosis of the 1920s, rather than to a legal defense of acts of extreme antigay violence (a term which emerged in the late 1970s). According to American psychologist Edward Kempf, who coined the term in 1920, it was very common:

The mechanism of homosexual panic (panic due to the pressure of uncontrollable perverse sexual cravings) is of the utmost importance in psychopathology because of the *frequency* of its occurrence whenever men or women must be grouped alone for prolonged periods, as in army camps, aboard ships, on exploring expeditions, in prisons, monasteries, schools, and asylums.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Benjamin Kahan, *The Book of Minor Perverts: Sexology, Etiology, and the Emergences of Sexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019), 34.

<sup>73</sup> Kahan, 39.

<sup>74</sup> Edward J. Kempf, *Psychopathology* (St. Louis, C.V. Mosby Company, 1920), 477; cited in Kahan, 39–40. Homosexual panic was included in the DSM-1 (1952), but has been excluded from subsequent editions. Homosexuality itself remained a mental illness in the DSM until 1974 (DSM-2, 6<sup>th</sup> printing) when it was removed due to additional research and opposition from gay rights activists. In the US and Canada, homosexual panic refers to fear felt by heterosexual men upon encountering gay men; it has been used successfully as a legal defence in high profile cases such as the murder of San Francisco Councilman Harvey Milk (1978) and university student Matthew Shepard (1998). In the UK, it is referred to as the ‘Portsmouth Defence’ or the

Kahan concludes that the dominance of the congenital model in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century has led to the erasure of the situational nature of much of sexuality itself; of circumstance and environment.<sup>75</sup>

Most of the men included in this study, particularly those from the middling and poorer sorts, are captured at one moment in their lives; seldom do their broader stories include any sort of sexual history. Many of them are young, when sexuality is at its most fluid. It is impossible to know whether their actions are simply a result of a situation, abandoned the moment they are out of it, or if they will unlock a previously unknown or unacknowledged desire. Jeremy Bentham suggested in 1785 that the very severity of the punishment and the “contempt and abhorrence” to which sodomites were subjected made them more likely to pursue sodomy exclusively. Rather than discouraging it, he argued that the opprobrium “renders them the more attached to one another, sympathy of itself having a powerful tendency, independent of all other motives, to attach a man to his own companions in misfortune.”<sup>76</sup> Bentham further argued that, if some sodomites do hate women, it is because this oppression is justified as being for their sake.<sup>77</sup> Certainly, the disgrace which followed the discovery of sodomitical activity made marriage and domestic life difficult, if not impossible. Dame Esther Bromley

---

‘Guardsman’s defence’ and has been sadly all too effective. Cf. Charlotte Knight and Kath Wilson, *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans People (LGBT) and the Criminal Justice System* (London, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 126.

<sup>75</sup> Kahan, *The Book of Minor Perverts*, 44.

<sup>76</sup> Jeremy Bentham, “Jeremy Bentham’s Essay on ‘Pederasty’: An Introduction,” ed. Louis Crompton, *Journal of Homosexuality* 3, no. 4 (1977): 403.

<sup>77</sup> Bentham, 403–4.

was granted a divorce in 1793 after presenting proof that her husband, Sir George Bromley, had been convicted of sodomitical assault at the Nottinghamshire Assizes.<sup>78</sup>

Provided that they did not do so regularly, and that such actions were prompted by fear, bribery or ignorance, youths (under the age of majority) could be involved in sodomitical encounters without necessarily suffering the same opprobrium reserved for their partner. Generally, the younger the boy, the less responsibility he was deemed to bear. However, if he seemed to actively desire and seek out the connection; if he engaged in sodomy repeatedly, with different partners, he was considered equally responsible as his partner. As will be seen in Chapter 1, even non-consensual encounters were often cast as being the ‘ruin’ of the young man involved. It was often assumed that, once acclimatized and initiated into the subculture, young men would continue such activities into adulthood, becoming sodomites involved with younger boys in turn. For adult catamites<sup>79</sup>, such as Thomas Edwards and Samuel Drybutter, their infamy was two-fold, adding effeminacy to the crime of sodomy. Often, however, both parties are referred to in popular discourse as ‘sodomites.’ When adult men are referred to as catamites, it is done so to imply corruption, effeminacy, and luxury.

---

<sup>78</sup> *Bromley v. Bromley*, High Court of Delegates, 1793, 2. Add. 158 n207.

<sup>79</sup> From the noun *Catamitus* (the Latinized form of *Ganymede*, the Trojan youth abducted by Zeus to be his lover), a catamite, usually a pubescent boy or youth, is one who takes the receptive part in anal intercourse. In Greek and Roman literature, it could be a term of endearment, but, when applied to an adult, was always an insult. In 18<sup>th</sup>-century usage, it generally referred to a youth being groomed for sex with an adult male, but when used to refer to an adult, doubles the insult with an imputation of effeminacy. Boys, unlike adult men, could be the receptive partners without necessarily impugning their developing masculinity. Cf. Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, Second Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 52–55; King, *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750*.



One element, which many were aware of at the time, is the clear socio-economic dimension to sodomitical encounters. When men were discovered together, accusations of sodomy were often conjoined with accusations of theft or blackmail. Many disputed encounters often came down to whose story was more believed: had money changed hands for the purposes of prostitution, or to avoid a false charge? Very often, men approached for sodomitical encounters were of lower station than their approachers – as well, they were often younger (in many cases, children or youths), and so at a social and economic disadvantage. As Tim Hitchcock points out, these encounters had much in common with heterosexual sexual encounters during this period, where poor/working women were considered sexually available to any man of higher station.<sup>80</sup> As well, the high proportion of soldiers (or former soldiers) in cases of sodomitical assault and blackmail suggests that many were willing to supplement their income with both prostitution and extortion.

## Understanding the Emotions in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Britain

As with sodomy, the language used to discuss emotions in 18<sup>th</sup>-century Britain had different connotations and implications than the same words do now. As Thomas Dixon points out, while *emotion* and *emotions* are defined in Johnson's dictionary<sup>81</sup>, they are limited in their meaning to describing agitation or disturbance (and not just of the mind; a storm could be understood as an emotion in the weather).<sup>82</sup> This term was seldom used by moral

---

<sup>80</sup> Tim Hitchcock, *English Sexualities, 1700-1800* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 64.

<sup>81</sup> Johnson provides no definitions at all for any of the words related to sodomy. This is part of a pattern of increasing silence on the topic and will be further explored in Chapter 1.

<sup>82</sup> Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions*, 63.

philosophers or theologians – instead, they spoke of appetites, passions, affections and sentiments. “The word passion signifies the receiving of any action in a large philosophical sense; in a more limited philosophical sense, it signifies any of the affections of human nature; as love, fear, joy, sorrow: but the common people confine it only to anger.”<sup>83</sup> This is how Samuel Johnson, referring to Isaac Watts as an authority on the subject, described *passion* in 1755. Passions, while a general term, referred to the ‘more violent commotions of the mind.’<sup>84</sup> *Affection* was also a very general term, but defined by Johnson as encompassing goodwill, love, and kindness towards other people, as well as fear, joy, sorrow, and anger.<sup>85</sup> Isaac Watts, however, points out that when used in a limited sense, it means love alone.<sup>86</sup> *Appetite* described “physical appetites, sensual desires and violent longings.”<sup>87</sup> *Feeling* as an adjective, meant “expressive of great sensibility”; *sensibility* was a “quickness of sensation”<sup>88</sup>; *sentiment* in 1755 warranted only a short entry as “thought, notion or opinion on the one hand, and sense or meaning on the other.”<sup>89</sup> By the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, scholars such as Thomas Cogan identified ‘emotions’ as a term used in familiar discourse interchangeably with passions. Cogan identifies emotions as the bodily effects of the passion experienced by the mind.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language [1755]*, ed. Brandi Besalke, Digital Edition of the 1755 Classic, 2017, 1461, <https://johnsonsdictionaryonline.com>.

<sup>84</sup> Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions*, 63.

<sup>85</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language [1755]*, 92.

<sup>86</sup> Isaac Watts, *The Doctrine of the Passions Explain'd and Improv'd* (Dublin: Printed by R. Reilly, 1737), 2.

<sup>87</sup> Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions*, 63.

<sup>88</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language [1755]*, 1788.

<sup>89</sup> Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions*, 64.

<sup>90</sup> Thomas Cogan, *A Philosophical Treatise on the Passions*, Third Edition, Revised (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1813), 7–8.

18th-century thinkers recognized that ‘things in nature and the life of man’ influence the passions and render a person susceptible to a given passion. Isaac Watts identified these factors as age, constitution, health, geography, and employment. Youth he considered more prone to gaiety and gladness, love and hope and courage, “because of the firmness of their nerves and vigor of their spirits”.<sup>91</sup> Old age was more liable to fear and sorrow; and childhood to sudden changes between grief and joy. Watts used the humoral system to determine how the ‘natural constitution’ predisposes a person to passion: those with a sanguine constitution are most susceptible to emotional responses, particularly ‘the gayer and bolder passions’, such as love and joy. The melancholy disposes one to grief and fear and consternation; and the choleric to anger and the desire for revenge.<sup>92</sup> Health too has an effect on the emotions, and poor health, ‘especially disorders of the nervous kind’, make one more likely to feel fear, sorrow and the ‘peevish passions’, and long illness can impair courage and patience and benevolence.<sup>93</sup> Geographic factors, such as the weather, and the climate; the season of the year, and the time of day, also play a critical role.<sup>94</sup> In terms of employment, Watts recognizes that poverty, hard work and hunger are all more likely to cause fear and anger, than happiness; he also identifies that men who are put above others in their daily stations, such as “commanders in armies and navies, governors of work-houses, the masters of publick schools, or those who have a great number of servants ... and a multitude of cares and concerns in human life” are prone to haughtiness, superiority, pride and vanity;

---

<sup>91</sup> Watts, *The Doctrine of the Passions Explain'd and Improv'd*, 58.

<sup>92</sup> Watts, 57–58.

<sup>93</sup> Watts, 58–59.

<sup>94</sup> Watts, 58, 60.

fretfulness, impatience and anger.<sup>95</sup> Though no longer considering the humours, Cogan, like Watts, recognized how the passions are influenced by temperament, by age, health, and national customs.<sup>96</sup> He also added the forces of habit, education, novelty, fashion and popular prejudice.<sup>97</sup>

Watts makes no mention of gender; Hume, however, argues that women have a weaker desire for sexual pleasure, and suggests that the repugnance expressed by women to approaches and expressions of lust are a result of the infamy which attends “the pernicious consequences of her pleasures.”<sup>98</sup> Thomas Cogan makes the most of gender differences in the experience of the passions. Women have a “much greater delicacy of character”, and their affections are geared towards “objects and duties which are more confined and domesticated.”<sup>99</sup> Women excel in gentleness, patience, compassion; in piety, in faith, hope and resignation.<sup>100</sup>

Many of these same factors could help create distinction emotional communities: gender, age, employment, nationality, education. Relational groups, such as clubs, friendships, families, could all create their own community, with distinctive emotional norms and

---

<sup>95</sup> Watts, 59–60.

<sup>96</sup> Cogan, *A Philosophical Treatise on the Passions*, 237–45.

<sup>97</sup> Cogan, 246–63.

<sup>98</sup> David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. L.A. Selby-Bigge, Reprinted from the Original Edition [1739] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), 572–73. Quote on p. 572.

<sup>99</sup> Cogan, *A Philosophical Treatise on the Passions*, 231.

<sup>100</sup> Cogan, 232–33.

expressions. While this dissertation largely separates emotional communities based on socio-economic factors, other communities will be discussed throughout each chapter.

## Social and Political Context

As seen above, while sodomy had been a crime in England and Wales since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and in the military since the 17<sup>th</sup>, it was seldomly prosecuted. The early modern sodomite had been an aberration; the 18<sup>th</sup> century recognized the sodomite as an urban commonplace. This change roughly coincided with the Glorious Revolution of 1688. One of the by-products of that Revolution was the national campaign for a “reformation of manners.” A movement calling for moral and spiritual reform, it lasted well into the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and included a huge range of activities – “from private prayers to parliamentary legislation, and from the foundation of missionary societies to the promotion of novel types of social and literary intercourse.” Among its main aims were the punishment of dissolute behavior, provision of new laws against vice, and the improvement of religious and moral standards in public and private life.<sup>101</sup> As Martin Ingram has shown, the idea of a reformation of manners was not new;<sup>102</sup> however, the formation of societies to encourage it was. These societies “spearheaded the broader movement at least until the turn of the century, set out to prosecute immorality using the secular law. They were active until the later 1730s, generated many

---

<sup>101</sup> Faramerz Dabhoiwala, “Sex and Societies for Moral Reform, 1688–1800,” *Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 2 (2007): 290, <https://doi.org/10.1086/510889>.

<sup>102</sup> Martin Ingram, “Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England,” in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, ed. Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996), 47–88.

counterparts elsewhere, and inspired similar associations in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.”<sup>103</sup>

The first of these societies, which spearheaded the first organized campaign, was the Society for the Reformation of Manners (SRM). From its establishment in 1691 until it published its last pamphlet in 1738, it was responsible for the bulk of sexual policing in the capital, including most of the prosecution of sodomites and the owners of the places they met.<sup>104</sup>

While the largest and most active of the societies was that in London, there were societies in Bristol, Canterbury, Coventry, Chester, Derby, Gloucester, Hull, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, Newcastle, Norwich, Nottingham, Northampton, Portsmouth, Reading, Shrewsbury, Wigan, Warrington and York by 1699. By the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, there were rural and county-wide societies in Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Cheshire, Gloucestershire, Kent, Monmouthshire, Staffordshire, Pembrokeshire, and the Isle of Wight.<sup>105</sup> There were also societies in Dublin and Edinburgh. Daniel Defoe was a member of the London Society, though he was very critical of the fact that punishments for immorality largely only fell on the poor members of society.<sup>106</sup> Despite his criticisms, he still believed in the goal of the

---

<sup>103</sup> Dabhoiwala, “Sex and Societies for Moral Reform, 1688–1800,” 290.

<sup>104</sup> Dabhoiwala, 302. Cf. Trumbach, “London’s Sodomites”; Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, chap. 4; Rictor Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House: The Gay Subculture in England, 1700–1830* (London: GMP, 1992), chaps. 2–3.

<sup>105</sup> Dabhoiwala, “Sex and Societies for Moral Reform, 1688–1800,” 297–98.

<sup>106</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea to All the Proclamations, Declarations, Acts of Parliament, &c, Which Have Been, or Shall Be Made, or Publish’d, for a Reformation of Manners, and Suppressing Immorality in the Nation.*, The Second Edition Corrected (London: Printed for A. Baldwin, 1698); Daniel Defoe, *Reformation of Manners: A Satyr*. (Printed in the Year MDCCII, 1702). Defoe clearly did not resign his membership of the London Society over this issue, when he joined the Edinburgh Society, he is described as a current member of “the Societies for Reformation in England”, cf. Charles Eaton Burch, “Defoe and the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners,” *The Review of English Studies* 16, no. 63 (1940): 307, <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/os-XVI.63.306>.

societies: in 1707, he became a member of the Edinburgh SRM, and shared with them prints and pamphlets from the London Society. He resigned in 1709 after the Edinburgh society refused to act against a member caught committing adultery.<sup>107</sup>

The large number of pamphlets and broadsides they distributed, the amount of money they raised by subscription, and the elaborate networks set up to register supporters suggest that they had a large popular membership and broad appeal, most of which were drawn from relatively humble trades and craftspeople. Most of these supporters merely contributed by a quarterly subscription. The core of the society, who attended monthly meetings and stood for election to officers, was only about 50 or 60 people, and most of the business was managed by a committee of nine.

Support for the SRM steadily diminished, and in fact the decline of the societies roughly coincided with the overhaul of London's policing system around 1740, replacing ordinary householders with dedicated constables, and the establishment of a permanent, salaried night watch in every parish. When the SRM was briefly revived between 1757 and 1766, they used radically different methods than the original societies had. Along with William Wilberforce's Proclamation Society in 1787, and the Society for the Suppression of Vice (founded 1802), the reformers raised money by subscription and encouraged constables and magistrates to put existing laws into effect, but seldom took an active role in policing or in prosecuting offenders.<sup>108</sup> The improvement in policing meant that, even though the later reform societies

---

<sup>107</sup> Burch, "Defoe and the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners."

<sup>108</sup> Dabhoiwala, "Sex and Societies for Moral Reform, 1688–1800," 307–8.

did not play an active a role in prosecuting sodomites, they continued to appear at quarter sessions and assizes.

Other literary, social and cultural trends coincided to increase the antipathy towards sodomy and its practitioners. A broader cultural awareness of the existence of sodomites was fostered by the activities of the SRMs, printed trial accounts and newspapers, literature and satire. Reactions against increasing commercialization and urbanization of society tended to evoke the image of the foreign, luxurious and effeminate sodomite. The rise of sentimentalism and evangelism advocated for emotional language and connection, but within a context which excluded physical expressions of love between men. Finally, the emergence of the middle-class towards the end of the 18th century led to an emphasis on decency, virtue and respectability which made recognition or mention of the sodomite taboo.

As a group, unlike the elite and the poor, the middling sorts are somewhat nebulous: historians have had trouble defining such a group. As well, several generations of historiography have dismantled the idea of a middle-class emerging as a result of the social and technological changes of the Industrial Revolution. Historians such as E.P. Thompson and Dror Wahrman have questioned its very existence as a solitary unit; Thompson argues that before the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, the middling sorts were invisible in terms of structures of power, which divided between a patrician elite and plebeian culture. Dror Wahrman has suggested that, socially, the middle was divided by a deep cultural rift, some oriented towards an aristocratic, London centered culture, and those who resisted it through assertive



localism.<sup>109</sup> John Brewer has looked at the reasons that the urban middle classes embraced the ideology of the Whig party, which was based on landed ideas of virtue and property. Brewer argues that the rising wealth and importance to the national economy of the middling sorts led them to be less content to depend on their aristocratic and landed representatives.<sup>110</sup> Not only had the increased financial burden from almost constant warfare of the 18<sup>th</sup> century fallen more heavily on the middling ranks (customs and excise) and on the poor,<sup>111</sup> but they had come to consider themselves ‘independent’ as a result of their wealth, and sought to free themselves from the corruption and client-patron relationships with the government.<sup>112</sup> They wanted the money they paid in taxes to go to urban and legal improvements which would make for easier and more profitable trade and manufacturing.<sup>113</sup> For the purposes of this study, the middling ranks include members of the professions: school-teachers, lower clergy, doctors, lawyers, and clerks. It includes journalists, merchants, stewards; and in the countryside yeomen. It also includes those in the ‘clean’ retail trades (innkeepers, large shopkeepers and wholesalers), and prosperous ‘dirty’ manual trades (tanners, butchers, or skilled metal and wood workers).<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (London: Merlin Press, 1991); Dror Wahrman, “National Society, Communal Culture: An Argument about the Recent Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain,” *Social History* 17, no. 1 (1992): 43–72. Cf. Paul Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman, 1689-1798*, Ford Lectures, 1990. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). Langford demonstrates the closing of ranks and increasing unity of propertied Englishmen over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>110</sup> John Brewer, “English Radicalism in the Age of George III,” in *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776*, ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1980), 333.

<sup>111</sup> Brewer, 338.

<sup>112</sup> Brewer, 339.

<sup>113</sup> Brewer, 341.

<sup>114</sup> These occupational categories are taken from Henry French, “The Search for the ‘Middle Sort of People’ in England, 1600-1800,” *Historical Journal* 43, no. 1 (2000): 281–82.

Traditional elites faced the issue of maintaining their authority and social clout. As the century progressed, the qualities which had justified these things: education, property, wealth and titles, were increasingly under threat from the rising middling ranks. As a result, as Linda Colley observes<sup>115</sup>, elites were under pressure to seem to conform to middling-sort ideas of morality and virtue but were particularly interested in ensuring the reputation and success of their family and connections. Whereas men like John Hervey had been able to be (relatively) open about their sexuality (provided they were not caught in the act), as the century progressed many elites were forced to flee the country in order to live safely. Rumours alone destroyed William Beckford, ending a burgeoning political career, deprived him of his chance at a peerage, and condemned him to a life of loneliness and isolation. Some, like John Child, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl Tylney and William Courtenay, the 9<sup>th</sup> Earl of Devon, were able to flee abroad before charges were laid, and thus did not forfeit their wealth and property. Others, like Percy Jocelyn, the Archbishop of Clogher, were declared outlaws, and deprived of their livings and properties. For the purposes of this study, the elite include landed property holders, both the aristocracy and extremely wealthy merchants, like William Beckford, who had estates and were connected by marriage to the aristocracy. It also includes the larger livings of the established church.

As will be seen in the following chapters, the poor were most flexible in terms of sexuality, even in their heterosexual relations. Economic and social pressures often required relaxation of strict norms of behaviour. When they were religious, they were more likely to be part of

---

<sup>115</sup> Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 192.

evangelical religious groups which appealed to emotion rather than education. This group included the poorly capitalized manual crafts (weavers, tailors, shoemakers, or petty retailers), common soldiers and sailors, and the labouring poor. Below that, are the extreme poor: the homeless, and those living in work- and poorhouses.

## Chapter Summaries

In the chapters that follow, I will consider the emotional reactions of sodomites and their broader community to the concept and existence of sodomy through sets of paired emotions. Each chapter will look at two ‘opposing’ emotions and, first, explore how those emotions function and are understood by British men and women of the 18<sup>th</sup> century; then, the chapter will conclude by examining how those emotions and that function can be observed around the topic of sodomy, and towards sodomites. The pairs of emotions themselves are drawn in large part from David Hume’s 1740 *Treatise on Human Nature*. In this work, he argues that what society deems to be virtues and vices are often different degrees and uses of the same emotions. These pairs of emotions are attraction and revulsion (which I rename lust and disgust), love and hatred, hope and fear, gratitude and anger, joy and sadness, pride and humility (or shame).

In the first chapter on lust and disgust, I argue that, between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, understandings of desire became tied to understandings of nature, some types of lust, understood as excessive desire, were considered ‘natural’, and so lost much of the moral disapproval they had formerly carried; while others, considered ‘unnatural’ became increasingly the target of moral disgust. The second chapter, love and hatred, considers how different socio-economic groups used language and existing relational frameworks (marriage,

friendship, patronage, etc.) to understand and express love between men; and how the defense of those relations was evoked in the manufacturing of hatred, and justification of violence against sodomites. The third chapter considers the interactions of four emotions: hope and fear & gratitude and anger. Fear of sodomites was used to justify anger against them; living in constant fear made hope extremely difficult, and sodomy was increasingly framed as ingratitude – to women, to nature, and to society. The fourth chapter considers joy and sadness – how happiness and joy increasingly became connected to the domestic, and particularly, to the presence of women – and thus excluded sodomites. Conversely, while sadness was frequently expressed by elite sodomites as an inherent part of sodomitical desire, mainstream discourse tied compassion – sadness for the condition of others, to the love of society and mankind, which sodomites were considered to be incapable of feeling. Finally, this dissertation considers how sodomites used awareness of historical, literary and elite sodomites to create a sense of history and pride in themselves, and to use it to attempt to withstand the broad sense of shame which came to dominate their desires and behaviours.

Gay hope is theirs by fancy fed,  
 Less pleasing when possessed;  
 The tear forgot as soon as shed,  
 The sunshine of the breast ...

These shall the fury Passions tear,  
     the vultures of the mind,  
     Disdainful Anger, pallid Fear,  
     And Shame that skulks behind;  
 Or pining Love shall waste their youth,  
     Or jealousy with rankling tooth,  
     That inly gnaws the secret heart,  
     And Envy wan, and faded Care,  
 Grim-visaged comfortless Despair,  
     And Sorrow's piercing dart.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Thomas Gray, *An Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College*. (London, 1747): lines 41-44, 61-70. Accessed at <http://www.thomasgray.org/cgi-bin/display.cgi?text=odec>

## Chapter 1

### Lust and Disgust

*... 'tis a Riddle to all virtuous Minds to find any Temptation in your odious Vice, that can be likely to bow a Man down to so unnatural a Villainy: for it could fill us with a greater Disdain, to see a Man eating Humane Excrements with Dogs, or the most stinking Carrion with Swine, than to consider your most abhorred Sin and Shame.*<sup>117</sup>

Minister of the Church of England, *The Sodomites Shame and Doom* (1702)

On Thursday, May 13<sup>th</sup>, 1762, two sailors belonging to the HMS *Newark* were court martialed for sodomy. According to crewman Joseph Britton, the night of 8 May, as he and William King were coming off-deck, they saw Martin Billin and James Bryan committing sodomy on the Middle Gun Deck. Britton pointed them out to King, who wrung his hands and was struck dumb with disgust. Britton and King seized them, shouting all the while for everyone to come see. On arrival, Joshua Jones, the Master at Arms, grabbed Bryan's penis, pulled it from Billin's body, and held it out for everyone to observe. In court, he described the sound it made as it was removed from Billin's body – like a cork being removed from a bottle. Thomas Sumner, the Steward's Mate, described the appearance of Bryan's yard – erect, with a little blood on it. While Jones denied that there was any offensive smell, the primary emotional reaction from the crew was one of disgust. Since emission was not proved, just penetration, the two men were sentenced to each receive a thousand lashes.<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Minister of the Church of England, *The Sodomites Shame and Doom, Laid before Them with Great Grief and Compassion*. (London: Printed for J. Downing, 1702), 2.

<sup>118</sup> ADM 1/5301 (Billin-Bryan Court Martial, 13 May 1762), TNA.

The case of Martin Billin and James Bryan shows both lust and disgust interacted within an emotional community. Their committing of sodomy was clearly the result of lust; the reactions of the crewmembers of the *Newark* resound with disgust. Moralists and theologians were united in their belief that unregulated desire led to social ills and personal vices. Aversion, the physical reaction to disturbing or disgusting material was frequently seen as a necessary purgative for the social body. Lust figures prominently in accounts of sodomy. Along with hatred and horror, which will be examined in later chapters, disgust is among the most common emotional reactions to sodomy and sodomites. This disgust was often expressed in a physical manner by the crowd: rolling the sodomite in feces, pelting them with dead animals, offal, or rotten food. This makes the disgust something that can be smelt by everyone with whom the unfortunate sodomite came into contact. This chapter will consider the passions of desire and aversion; of lust and disgust; and how different emotional communities experienced and expressed these passions when faced with the sight, smell, and sound of sodomy.

## Lust, Disgust, and the Academy

While lust has seldom been considered as an historical topic, discussions of sexual arousal and practices and of attitudes toward them, have long been a staple of the history of sexuality. Putting aside the historiography of prostitution (which has generally seen prostitutes as female)<sup>119</sup>, and

---

<sup>119</sup> This strange lacuna in the historiography seems to be due to its place at the crossroads of a number of topics: work on men's labour is largely the history of business or trade unionism (from which male prostitutes are excluded); studies of prostitution more generally have considered it as part of women's history, particularly of the sexual oppression and subjugation of women, and so naturally do not consider male prostitutes. Studies on the history of 'homosexuality' (or of sodomy, for this period) have largely been written with the aim of freeing same-

work on women's sexuality, there are several relevant historiographical discussions: those of 'deviant' sex, pornography and erotica, and libertinism. Histories of luxury have also observed the intellectual relationship between excessive desires: greed, gluttony, and lust.

Prior to the 1960s, social history largely ignored sex except as it related to marriage and childbirth. Since the mid-70s, there has been an explosion of historical works on sexuality, most of which are "engaged with issues and ... actors defined as exceptional, either by outsiders or participants."<sup>120</sup> Given this, there are some excellent studies on marginal, 'deviant' types of sexuality. In addition to works on sodomy, scholars have considered sexual behaviours such as masturbation,<sup>121</sup> incest,<sup>122</sup> group sex,<sup>123</sup> sadomasochism,<sup>124</sup> and bestiality.<sup>125</sup> Julie Peakman

---

sex activity from its connections to criminality, and so avoid or gloss over discussions of male prostitutes. This is not the case for the later 19<sup>th</sup> century, where discussion of male prostitution has been quite extensive.

<sup>120</sup> Victoria Harris, "Sex on the Margins: New Directions in the Historiography of Sexuality and Gender," *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 4 (2010): 1086.

<sup>121</sup> Notable examples include: Paula Bennett and Vernon A. Rosario, eds., *Solitary Pleasures: The Historical, Literary, and Artistic Discourses of Autoeroticism* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Jean Stengers and Anne Van Neck, *Masturbation: The History of a Great Terror*, trans. Kathryn Hoffmann (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001); Thomas W. Laqueur, *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation* (New York: Zone Books, 2003).

<sup>122</sup> Incest has been studied far less than other marginalized sex acts: Michael Mitterauer, "The Customs of the Magians: The Problem of Incest in Historical Societies," in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*, ed. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 231–50; Lynn Sacco, *Unspeakable: Father-Daughter Incest in American History* (Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009). Lawrence Stone shows how strict consanguinity laws could lead to 'accidental' incest in *Uncertain Unions: Marriage in England, 1660-1753* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

<sup>123</sup> An early example is Bruno Partridge, *A History of Orgies*, SevenOaks Edition (London: SevenOaks, 1958). For a case study cf. Lawrence Stone, "Libertine Sexuality in Post-Restoration England: Group Sex and Flagellation among the Middling Sort in Norwich in 1706-07," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2, no. 4 (1992): 511–26.

<sup>124</sup> Ian Gibson, *The English Vice: Beating, Sex, and Shame in Victorian England and After* (London: Duckworth, 1978); Vern Bullough, Dwight Dixon, and Joan Dixon, "Sadism, Masochism and History: Or, When Is Behaviour Sado-Masochistic?," in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*, ed. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 47–62.

<sup>125</sup> For Bestiality, cf. Robert F. Oaks, "'Things Fearful to Name': Sodomy and Buggery in Seventeenth-Century New England," *Journal of Social History* 12, no. 2 (1978): 268–81; E. William Monter, "Sodomy and Heresy in Early Modern Switzerland," in *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*, ed. Salvatore Licata and Robert Peterson, Research on Homosexuality (New York: Haworth Press, 1981), 41–55; Jonathan Goldberg, "Bradford's 'Ancient Members' and 'A Case of Buggery ... Amongst Them,'" in *Nationalisms and Sexualities*, by Andrew Parker et al. (New York: Routledge, 1991); Jonas Liliequist, "Peasants against Nature: Crossing the Boundaries between Man



looks at societal reactions and understandings of ‘unnatural’ sexuality, looking at how they influenced modern prejudices.<sup>126</sup>

Studies of erotica and pornography<sup>127</sup> have contributed to academic understandings of lust through looking at mass-marketed literary erotic writing and enquiring as to what 18th-century readers found erotic. Studies of libertinism have also contributed to understandings of the relationship between lust, sexuality, gender, class and power.<sup>128</sup> Other studies on the subject have considered the relationship between libertine sexuality, atheism, and philosophy.<sup>129</sup> While scholars of luxury have largely considered the topic in relation to the growth of capitalism,<sup>130</sup>

---

and Animal in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Sweden,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1, no. 3 (1991): 393–423; John M. Murrin, “‘Things Fearful to Name’: Bestiality in Colonial America,” *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 65 (1998): 8–43; Jens Rydstrom, *Sinners and Citizens: Bestiality and Homosexuality in Sweden, 1880-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Doron S. Ben-Atar and Richard D. Brown, *Taming Lust: Crimes Against Nature in the Early Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014).

<sup>126</sup> Julie Peakman, *Lascivious Bodies: A Sexual History of the Eighteenth Century* (Halifax, NS: Atlantic Books, 2004); *The Pleasure’s All Mine: A History of Perverse Sex* (London: Reaktion Books, 2013); *Amatory Pleasures: Explorations in Eighteenth-Century Sexual Culture* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016).

<sup>127</sup> H. Montgomery Hyde, *A History of Pornography*. (London: Heinemann, 1964); David Foxon, *Libertine Literature in England 1660-1745* (Secaucus, NJ: Carol Publishing Group, 1965); Peter Wagner, *Eros Revived: Erotica of the Enlightenment in England and America* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1988); Lynn Avery Hunt, ed., *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800* (New York: Zone Books, 1993); Julie Peakman, *Mighty Lewd Books: The Development of Pornography in Eighteenth-Century England* (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Karen Harvey, *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>128</sup> L. C. Jones, *The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942); Geoffrey Ashe, *The Hell-Fire Clubs: A History of Anti-Morality* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000); Evelyn Lord, *The Hell-Fire Clubs: Sex, Satanism and Secret Societies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008). For Scotland, cf. David Stevenson, *The Beggar’s Benison: Sex Clubs of Enlightenment Scotland and Their Rituals* (East Linton, UK: Tuckwell Press, 2001). For Ireland, there is David Ryan, *Blasphemers & Blackguards: The Irish Hellfire Clubs* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2012).

<sup>129</sup> Brian Cowan, “Reasonable Ecstasies: Shaftesbury and the Languages of Libertinism,” *Journal of British Studies* 37, no. 2 (1998): 111–38; Jean-Pierre Cavaille, “Libertine and Libertinism: Polemic Uses of the Terms in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English and Scottish Literature,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 12, no. 2 (2012): 12–36.

<sup>130</sup> Werner Sombart, *Luxury and Capitalism [1913]*, trans. W.R. Dittmar (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967); Elizabeth Gilboy, “Demand as a Factor in the Industrial Revolution (1932),” in *The Causes of the Industrial*

more recent studies by Christopher Berry and Maxine Berg have begun to associate it with other forms of excess desire, including lust.<sup>131</sup>

Until very recently, disgust continued to be largely overlooked in theories of emotions and aesthetic apprehension; and is still mostly absent from historical enquiries. Philosopher Aurel Kolnai divides disgust into two aspects: material and moral. Material disgust is a visceral response to foul and contaminated objects, while moral disgust is a disgust reaction to persons or behaviors that transgress social norms.<sup>132</sup> Anthropologists such as Mary Douglas draw on concepts of disgust to explore social elements such as religious taboos and uncleanness.<sup>133</sup> Her work, originally published in 1966, has had a large influence in a variety of disciplines, particularly philosophy, psychology, and religious studies.<sup>134</sup> Feminist theorist Julia Kristeva, drawing on post-modern theory and psychoanalysis, argues that the horror/disgust reaction is a human response to the liminal – it is not death itself that disgusts, but things associated with death: disease, infected wounds, rot.<sup>135</sup>

---

*Revolution in England*, ed. R. M. Hartwell, *Debates in Economic History* (London: Methuen, 1967), 121–38; John U. Nef, *Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization*, Wiles Lectures 1956 (Cambridge: University Press, 1958); Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982).

<sup>131</sup> Christopher J. Berry, *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Eger, eds., *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

<sup>132</sup> Aurel Kolnai, *On Disgust* (1929), ed. Barry Smith and Carolyn Korsmeyer (Chicago: Open Court, 2004).

<sup>133</sup> Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*, Routledge Classics Edition (London: Routledge, 2002).

<sup>134</sup> Robbie Duschinsky, Simone Schnall, and Daniel Weiss, eds., *Purity and Danger Now: New Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

<sup>135</sup> Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay in Abjection*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982).

In the last thirty years, the topic has seen an explosion of interest, from diverse fields such as psychology, biology, philosophy, anthropology, literary studies, and art. Neuro- and evolutionary biologists often consider it “a primitive, protective aversion with strong reactive properties”<sup>136</sup> – one that is extremely resistant to change. Postmodern artists have made full use of the reactive properties of disgust to convey powerful political, social, and religious messages<sup>137</sup>, and moral philosophers treat it as a sophisticated, educable, and “potentially dangerous emotion that produces value judgments of great power.”<sup>138</sup>

Recent theoretical approaches to disgust have included medievalist William Miller’s *Anatomy of Disgust* (1997), and Winfried Menninghaus’s massive examination of disgust in German philosophy, *Disgust: The Theory and History of a Strong Sensation* (2003).<sup>139</sup> Moral philosopher Martha Nussbaum considers disgust in legal judgments. In *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame and the Law* (2004), she considers how moral disgust is frequently used to justify group subordination; of women, Jews, and homosexuals.<sup>140</sup> Robert Rawdon Wilson’s *The Hydra’s*

---

<sup>136</sup> Carolyn Korsmeyer, *Savoring Disgust: The Foul and the Fair in Aesthetics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 4. For an overview of biological approaches to disgust, cf. Valerie Curtis, *Don’t Look, Don’t Touch, Don’t Eat: The Science Behind Revulsion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013).

<sup>137</sup> Arthur C. Danto, *The Abuse of Beauty: Aesthetics and the Concept of Art* (Chicago: Open Court, 2003).

<sup>138</sup> Korsmeyer, *Savoring Disgust*, 4.

<sup>139</sup> William Ian Miller, *The Anatomy of Disgust* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Winfried Menninghaus, *Disgust: The Theory and History of a Strong Sensation*, trans. Howard Eiland and Joel Golb (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2003).

<sup>140</sup> Martha Nussbaum, *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004). Like homosexuals, women’s bodies have been particularly subjugated as disgusting – many cultures isolate women during their period; lactation, sweat, and other bodily functions are also seen as disgusting.

*Tale: Imagining Disgust* considers how disgust is evoked in literature, art, and media to reinforce power relations and police difference.<sup>141</sup>

## Lust and Disgust in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Thought

Post-Reformation Anglican theology conceived lusts of any kind as being the result of false religious doctrines, but this began to change in the last decade of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. According to Harry Cocks, the increasing size and influence of Dissenting Protestant sects after 1662, and their receiving qualified religious toleration in 1689, caused English theologians to begin to “decouple the link between religious nonconformity and immorality”<sup>142</sup> and emphasize that sins such as lust were the excessive expression of a natural tendency. Where false religion had been the cause of lust and sin, now lust and sin were the cause of false religion: atheists particularly were led to unbelief by the pleasures of lust, which clouded their reason and drew them away from God. As John Marshall has shown, 17<sup>th</sup>- and 18<sup>th</sup>-century freethinkers were sensitive to this reputation and were quick to distance their theories from toleration of sin, and especially of sodomy.<sup>143</sup> It was in the countries where (Protestant) religious toleration was strongest that sodomites were “discovered” as a serious social problem in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Robert Rawdon Wilson, *The Hydra's Tale: Imagining Disgust* (Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta Press, 2002).

<sup>142</sup> Harry Cocks, *Visions of Sodom: Religion, Homoerotic Desire, and the End of the World in England, c. 1550-1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), 19. In this, they excluded Catholicism and deists/atheists.

<sup>143</sup> John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 707–19.

<sup>144</sup> Cocks, *Visions of Sodom*, 19. Britain and the Netherlands both found large groups of sodomites in the 1720s.

For Robert Carr, lust worked on the whole body, and was thus difficult for ‘carnally-minded’ people to deny. As he observed in 1690, “lust works in the eye gazing upon Beauty, in the ear hearkening to lascivious Discourse, in the hand by a wanton Dalliance, and in the Palate delighted in the tasting of dainty Meats and Drinks.”<sup>145</sup> While lust could be applied to any excessive desire; it was usually understood as relating to sex. In 18<sup>th</sup>-century dictionaries, this was usually the primary definition, though they retained their universality. For John Kersey (1702) lust is an “unlawful passion or desire of the flesh”<sup>146</sup>, while Nathan Bailey (1730) defined lust as an unlawful (but natural) passion or desire.<sup>147</sup> Samuel Johnson (1755) defines lust as carnal desire, or any violent or irregular desire.<sup>148</sup> For John Ash (1775), to lust for something is to desire something carnally, or earnestly.<sup>149</sup> According to James Barclay (1799), lust is a carnal or lewd desire, or any irregular or violent desire; while to lust is to have unchaste desires.<sup>150</sup>

Whether licit or illicit, natural or unnatural, lust’s defining feature was its boundlessness. Carr observed that lust was “a habit of corrupt affection,” and that “such a lustful disposition ... is affected upon almost every occasion or temptation.”<sup>151</sup> ‘A Spiritual Observator’, columnist for

---

<sup>145</sup> Robert Carr, *An Antidote against Lust: Or, A Discourse of Uncleaness* (London: Printed by J. Ashwood for John Dunton, 1690), 10–12.

<sup>146</sup> John Kersey, *A New English Dictionary: Or, Compleat Collection of the Most Proper and Significant Words, Commonly Used in the Language*. (London: Printed for Henry Bonwicke, 1702).

<sup>147</sup> Nathan Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum: Or a More Compleat Universal Etymological English Dictionary than Any Extant*. (London: Printed for T. Cox, 1730).

<sup>148</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 1237.

<sup>149</sup> John Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols. (London: Printed for Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775).

<sup>150</sup> James Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary* (London: Printed for G. G. and J. Robinson, 1799).

<sup>151</sup> Carr, *An Antidote against Lust: Or, A Discourse of Uncleaness*, 21–26.

the *Post Angel*, considered it the opposite of virtue; just as virtue can never be moved by lust, lust “will prey on garbidge [sic]...”<sup>152</sup> For Shaftesbury, lust, particularly in youths, enters through the senses (through vulgar language, pleasant sights, excessive eating), and corruption follows, until “their Appetites so exasperated and enflam’d to such a degree beyond all natural temperature.” With their appetites thus swollen, men are likely to break into “all horridness of unnatural and monstrous Lusts, regarding neither Sex nor Species...”<sup>153</sup> David Hume considered beauty as a necessary intermediary between refined love and the vulgar “appetite to generation.”<sup>154</sup> Medical doctor Thomas Cogan defined lust at the start of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as ‘inordinate desires, which transgress the bounds of sobriety and decency.’<sup>155</sup>

Moralists concerned with the increasing temptations of a growing commercial society emphasized the dangers inherent in over-indulgence, and counselled prayer, moderation, hard work, and ascetic habits.<sup>156</sup> Failure to do so was disastrous. George Hickes felt that, if one did not restrain lust, he “had made an utter Shipwreck both of his Conscience and Honour, and [was] become as brutal, and shameless as a beast.”<sup>157</sup> Shaftesbury felt that over-indulgence of sexual desire led to corruption, effeminacy, and slavery to the passions.<sup>158</sup> Others warned that the

---

<sup>152</sup> *Post Angel*, March 1701.

<sup>153</sup> Anthony Ashley Cooper Shaftesbury, *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue*. (London: Printed for A. Bell, E. Castle and S. Buckley, 1699), 177–78.

<sup>154</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 395.

<sup>155</sup> Cogan, *A Philosophical Treatise on the Passions*, 81.

<sup>156</sup> Carr, *An Antidote against Lust: Or, A Discourse of Uncleanness*.

<sup>157</sup> George Hickes, *Sermons on Several Subjects*, vol. 1 (London: Printed for A.C. and sold by W. Taylor, 1715), 12.

<sup>158</sup> Cowan, “Reasonable Ecstasies: Shaftesbury and the Languages of Libertinism,” 126.

pleasure of lust came at the cost of happiness, health, and “an unexpected Reckoning, that closes up their unlawful Pleasures in the black and dismal Sables of Death.”<sup>159</sup>

Such thinking was in reaction to libertine and libertarian discourses about lust. As Faramerz Dabhoiwala observes, the libertine was “defending promiscuity,” and the libertarian was “concerned to liberate sexual conduct from unreasonable rules and traditions”: in both cases, “the justification of sex as a healthy natural activity was almost invariably restricted to heterosexual intercourse.”<sup>160</sup> Restoration libertine John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, felt that, as long as one did not do anything to hurt another person or oneself, all pleasure, including sexual pleasure, “was to be indulged as the gratification of our natural Appetites. It seemed unreasonable to imagine these were put into a man only to be restrained or curbed to such a narrowness.”<sup>161</sup> Over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, views regarding marriage, divorce, and fornication grew increasingly permissive, much to the distress of evangelical Christians.<sup>162</sup> Matthew Tindal observed in 1730 “... that warm Desire, which is implanted in human Nature, can’t be criminal, when perus’d after such a Manner, as tends to most promote the Happiness of the Parties; and to propagate and

---

<sup>159</sup> Nathaniel Crouch, *Unparallel’d Varieties: Or, the Matchless Actions and Passions of Mankind [1697].*, The fourth edition. (London: Printed for A. Bettesworth, 1728), 167.

<sup>160</sup> Faramerz Dabhoiwala, *The Origins of Sex: A History of the First Sexual Revolution* (London: Allan Lane, 2012), 118.

<sup>161</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *Some Passages of the Life and Death of the Right Honourable John, Earl of Rochester [1680]*, ed. Lord Ronald Charles Sutherland Gower (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), 38.

<sup>162</sup> The growing popularity of evangelical Christianity after 1790 among the emerging middle-class put pressure on this narrative. The sexual scandals of the aristocracy (particularly in the wake of that surrounding Queen Caroline) were used to propel middling sort demands for political and moral reform. Cf. Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*; Dror Wahrman, *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). However, as Anna Clark has shown, poor Methodists and Baptists, torn between social pressures and strict religious views, often embraced antinomian preachers, such as John Church, who preached God’s radical love. “The Sexual Crisis and Popular Religion in London, 1770-1820,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 34 (Fall 1988): 56–69.

preserve the Species.”<sup>163</sup> In Fielding’s *Tom Jones*, the fornicator Mr. Square declares that “‘Fitness is governed by the nature of things, and not by customs, forms, or municipal laws. Nothing is, indeed, unfit which is not unnatural.’ ... ‘Right!’” cries Jones, ‘What can be more innocent than the indulgence of a natural appetite? Or what more laudable than the propagation of our species?’”<sup>164</sup> This permissiveness only went so far: it must be ‘natural’, and it must not cause public harm. Thus, while fornication and adultery (when committed by men)<sup>165</sup> were permissible, incest, sodomy and masturbation were not.<sup>166</sup> Chastity was a virtue in women, but in men was thought to cause madness and poor health.<sup>167</sup>

As Benedict Robinson has shown, ‘disgust’ was invented in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The word disgust, first used in 1598, had appeared (in print) over a thousand times by 1700.<sup>168</sup> The early modern theory of the passions depended on the difference between attraction and revulsion; differences which were thought to originate in moral reactions to good and evil.<sup>169</sup> This is the theory of

---

<sup>163</sup> Matthew Tindal, *Christianity as Old as the Creation: Or, The Gospel, a Republication of the Religion of Nature*. (London: n.p., 1730), 345.

<sup>164</sup> Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling* [1749], ed. Frank Kermode (New York: New American Library, 1963), 194–95.

<sup>165</sup> Dr. Johnson, who had a great aversion to licentiousness, thought there was a ‘boundless’ difference between (discreet) adultery on the part of a husband, which was no ‘very material injury’ to the wife, and female infidelity, which risked undermining ‘all the property in the world.’ James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson L.L.D.* [1791], ed. Ernest Rhys, Everyman’s Library, vol. ii (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1913), 288.

<sup>166</sup> Faramerz Dabhoiwala, “Lust and Liberty,” *Past & Present*, no. 207 (2010): 139.

<sup>167</sup> *An Essay on Celibacy* (London: Printed for M. Cooper, 1753). Protestant polemics against Catholicism tended to see celibacy as leading to sexual vice, such as sodomy or masturbation. However, most Protestant sects in England in the 18<sup>th</sup> century were ambivalent about celibacy, not condemning it, but not promoting it. Cf. Erik R. Seeman, “‘It Is Better to Marry Than to Burn’: Anglo-American Attitudes toward Celibacy, 1600-1800,” *Journal of Family History* 24, no. 4 (1999): 397–419.

<sup>168</sup> Benedict Scott Robinson, “Disgust c. 1600,” *ELH* 81, no. 2 (2014): 553.

<sup>169</sup> Susan James, *Passion and Action: The Emotions in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 4.



aversion described by Francis Hutcheson: pain on the perception of an object, due to a comprehension of evil, results in aversion.<sup>170</sup> Aversion, in this context, becomes folded into either hatred or fear, which allows for “the ethical intelligibility of bodily experience, making physical revulsion stand in for ontological alienation.” In a second theory of aversion, disgust occurs when a bodily desire has reached satiety.<sup>171</sup> In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, both aspects of aversion, loathing and disgust, would combine to express moral outrage. Early dictionaries, such as those of John Kersey and Nathan Bailey, use one theory or another. For Kersey, disgust is dislike, while Bailey sees it as distaste.<sup>172</sup> Samuel Johnson includes both material disgust, ‘aversion of the palate from anything’; while moral disgust emerges in the verb, with the sense of offensive behaviour.<sup>173</sup> John Ash considers the verb disgust as ‘to raise an aversion in the stomach or to offend, to cause aversion.’<sup>174</sup> Barclay considers disgust is displeasure arising from some disagreeable action or behaviour.<sup>175</sup>

Isaac Watts combines the two theories into several degrees of disgust: the very word ‘is borrowed from the Disagreeableness of Food to our Palate, and it is most frequently used in such a Case, where the object has been once agreeable, but now ceases to be so.’<sup>176</sup> When this disgust is raised to a ‘very high Degree’, it is *abhorrence*; “and sometimes by a Metaphor borrowed

---

<sup>170</sup> Francis Hutcheson, *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, vol. 1 (London: Printed by John Darby, 1725), 4.

<sup>171</sup> Robinson, “Disgust c. 1600,” 554. The preceding quote is taken from the same page.

<sup>172</sup> Kersey, *A New English Dictionary*, 1702; Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*.

<sup>173</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 609.

<sup>174</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*.

<sup>175</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1799.

<sup>176</sup> Watts, *The Doctrine of the Passions Explain'd and Improv'd*, 34.

from disagreeable Food, 'tis called *loathing*." For Adam Smith, the origin of the emotion of disgust is rooted in 'aversion for all the appetites which take their origin from the body'.<sup>177</sup>

Smith rejects the view that this is due to the fact that these appetites are shared with animals; one feels disgust at another's appetites because one cannot share them, and at one's own, because, once sated, they are sources of disgust.

## Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy

*... Lust is so wild a passion, that it flies out into all manner of Extravagancies; ... In the 18 of Leviticus, 22, 23 you read, **Thou shalt not lye with Mankind as with Womankind, neither shalt thou lye with any Beast to defile thy self therewith, it is abomination.** Which shows how desperately wicked the heart is in this kind, that it hath all uncleanness in it, as it is said to work all, or all manner of uncleanness with greediness.*<sup>178</sup>

In *The Sodomite's Shame and Doom* (1702), a 'Minister of the Church of England' contrasts the life of the Christian, "...sanctified by the *Holy Spirit* of God, ... exempted from the *Perturbations* and *Pollutions* of inordinate and base Lusts" with the sodomite, who is "the *Reverse* of all this." He goes on to describe the state of the sodomite's soul: they are "as Stables of Unclean Beasts, *defiled, deformed, destroyed* by the most execrable Abominations," while their minds "are polluted by the filthiest *Imaginations*."<sup>179</sup> Their affections are base, and their consciences laid waste.

---

<sup>177</sup> Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments; ... to Which Is Added, A Dissertation on the Origin of Languages* [1759], ed. Dugald Stewart, New Edition (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), 34.

<sup>178</sup> Carr, *An Antidote against Lust: Or, A Discourse of Uncleanness*, 21–26.

<sup>179</sup> Minister of the Church of England, *The Sodomites Shame and Doom, Laid before Them with Great Grief and Compassion.*, 1.

For many Britons in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century, lust and disgust were two emotions particularly associated with sodomy. Sodomy was the ultimate expression of lust: illicit desire swollen to such an extent as to break the bonds of nature itself. Sodomy, with its infertility and anality, was inherently disgusting: unclean, bestial; associated with feces and excess. This connection was enshrined in law: the 2<sup>nd</sup> Article of War specifically targeted ‘uncleanness’, and sailors who committed sodomitical activities (short of sodomy itself) were tried under this article. Sodomy was associated with excess of all sorts: with luxury; fine foods and too much drink; Italian opera and the French language; feminine lack of control rather than manly restraint.

Descriptions of sodomy ooze with disgust – disgusting itself is the most common word, but also loathsome, revolting, vile, dirty and foul. It is associated with feces and anality, addiction and disease, contamination, and even with death. As Arthur Gilbert observes, “... the sodomite was wedded to the bowels and thus to the bowels of the earth where men rotted and decayed”.<sup>180</sup>

Punishments (both legal and extralegal) involved making explicit this association – men associated with sodomy, whether in the pillory or in the streets, soon found their bodies covered with the most disgusting items at hand. Different social strata made this connection between sodomy and the twinned emotions of lust and disgust.

## Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy Among the Elite

The following two subsections will consider how elite sodomites attempted to safely engage in their physical need for sexual contact, while knowing that doing so would result in their

---

<sup>180</sup> Arthur N. Gilbert, “Sexual Deviance and Disaster During the Napoleonic Wars,” *Albion* 9, no. 1 (1977): 98.

becoming an object of disgust and a social pariah, even if there were no legal ramifications. The first subsection will deal with how elite sodomites understood their need for sexual contact, and how they attempted to reduce the great risks of having those needs met. The second subsection will consider how elite circles dealt with the ‘disgusting’ issue of sodomy in a way which protected their privilege and reinforced social dominance.

### ‘Some Nutriment More Suitable to the Human Body’: Lust and Sodomy in Elite Circles.

“I cannot exist on agates, china and crystal,” declared William Beckford (1760-1844) to his friend Gregorio Franchi (1770-1828), “I need some nutriment more suitable to the human body”.<sup>181</sup> Beckford’s letter makes clear he is not talking about food, but about sex. He bemoans the lack of options “...so many cries, so many prayers to heaven in vain – no one attractive, nothing of the right kind. All this would make the holiest of spirits fit for damnation.”

Lust, particularly expressed by members of the elite, is frequently tied with other expressions of bodily desire – such as hunger, or thirst; it is frequently tied in accounts to other excesses of pleasure, such as greed or luxury, gluttony. Even those with a more positive understanding of lust considered it an appetite. Lord Hervey told Stephen Fox that he wished that Fox would “not only ... have me always at your table, but to eat of no other.”<sup>182</sup> The classical and modern stories

---

<sup>181</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 17 July 1814. Printed in William Beckford, *Life at Fonthill, 1807-1822, with Interludes in Paris and London, from the Correspondence of William Beckford*, ed. Boyd Alexander (London: R. Hart-Davis, 1957), 153–54.

<sup>182</sup> Lord Hervey to Stephen Fox, 27 June 1728. Published in *Lord Hervey and His Friends, 1726-38: Based on Letters from Holland House, Melbury and Ickworth*, ed. Giles Stephen Holland Fox-Strangways Ilchester, 1st ed (London: Murray, 1950), 31.

included in Thomas Cannon's *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Compared* use food and drink as metaphors for sexual desire, one gives a boy "a thousand hungry kisses,"<sup>183</sup> while another fears not being able to "taste the joys."<sup>184</sup> He also mocks the chaste ideal of platonic love:

What; are we perpetually to converse with Youths of a Fairness, which only does not overflow the Eyes; and when we can lay our Lips to it, and take a Draught shall we be such foolish *Tantalus's* to suffer Thirst? The airy Food of seeing and hearing does not satisfy a hale Appetite.<sup>185</sup>

Unlike food, however, lust was an appetite that could be fed only with the utmost care. Elite sodomites used not only the protection of anonymity (which many sodomites depended on), but by engaging in relationships with boys, and men of the poorer sorts, they lessened the danger of discovery. First, however, they had to entice men to join them. The misadventure of Capt. Edward Rigby shows some of the techniques elite men would use.

### Poor Men, Brothels and Servants: Elite Negotiations with Lust

On November 5<sup>th</sup>, 1698, Capt. Edward Rigby, a naval captain and Lancashire gentleman, met a young servant named William Minton in St. James' Park, where both men had assembled to watch the fireworks. As the two men stood there in the dark, Rigby took Minton "by the hand, and squeez'd it; put his Privy Member Erected into Minton's Hand; kist him, and put his Tongue

---

<sup>183</sup> Hal Gladfelder, ed., "The Indictment of John Purser, Containing Thomas Cannon's *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplified*," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 31, no. 1 (2007): 47.

<sup>184</sup> Gladfelder, 50.

<sup>185</sup> Gladfelder, 51.

into Minton's Mouth."<sup>186</sup> Before the two men parted, Rigby told Minton to meet him at room Number 4, at St. George's Tavern in Pall Mall. Minton did so, but only to arrange for Rigby's arrest. Minton's subsequent testimony, which resulted in Rigby's conviction on charges of sodomitical assault at the Old Bailey in December,<sup>187</sup> reveals a great deal about the expression of lust in sodomitical encounters. Rigby told Minton that he had 'raised his lust to the highest degree'; even to the point that he had ejaculated in his breeches. He sat on Minton's lap, kissing him, and asking "if he should F--- him." To Minton's response - that only women were able to raise lust - Rigby offered to show him how sex worked between men. Since Minton stopped him before the fact was committed, Rigby was saved the capital charge; but he was pilloried three times, and sentenced to 12 months in Newgate, and an astronomical £1000 fine.<sup>188</sup>

The expression of lust Rigby shared with Minton is replayed in endless variations throughout the following century and beyond. Rigby's initial expression of sexual interest in Minton – by pressing his erect penis into Minton's hand and kissing him - is not at all uncommon, as will be seen later in this chapter. Such an open approach to a stranger was extremely risky. Several newspaper reports over the following century relate cases of unnamed gentlemen (or at least 'genteelly dressed') committing suicide upon being discovered with a poor man in public parks

---

<sup>186</sup> MJ/SP/1698/12/024, LMA.

<sup>187</sup> Anon., *An Account of the Proceedings against Capt. Edward Rigby, at the Sessions of Goal Delivery, Held at Justice-Hall in the Old-Bailey, on Wednesday the Seventh Day of December, 1698, for Intending to Commit the Abominable Sin of Sodomy, on the Body of One William Minton* (London: Printed by F. Collins, 1698), 1. Since Rigby was a naval officer, he was tried by the Admiralty at the Old Bailey.

<sup>188</sup> Rigby would ultimately serve over two years imprisonment, due to his inability to pay such a large fine. He was eventually discharged from prison in the spring of 1701, after the government agreed to forgive all but £200 of the fine. TNA SP 44/100 f. 503; SP 44/237 f. 249, SP 44/238 f. 439; and SP 44/348 f. 250-251.

or private rooms of public houses.<sup>189</sup> Others, such as the Bishop of Clogher, fled the country rather than face the consequences of discovery. In 1823, the Rev. Thomas Jephson, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, found himself on trial for attempting to convince labourer James Welch to permit him to commit sodomy upon his body. Much of Jephson's defence rested on the unlikelihood that a man of the Rev. Jephson's quality could be so impolite as to expose himself and solicit a poor boy in a gravel pit in broad daylight. The jury were not entirely convinced, given the amount of evidence for the prosecution, but the sheer number of people of quality who appeared as character witnesses swayed the jury to give him an extremely qualified acquittal.<sup>190</sup>

Due to the riskiness of such a strategy of fulfilling lust, gentlemen developed slightly less dangerous methods, such as the use of intermediaries, or the cultivation of relationships which would make reporting difficult. Intermediaries were often keepers of molly houses, who helped gentlemen find poor or unemployed young men, as well as providing them with rooms and a (relatively) safe environment. According to Edward Courtney, an out-of-work-servant and prostitute, ale-house keeper George Whittle frequently arranged for 'wedding nights' with country gentlemen – encounters in which the gentlemen would 'pay ... handsomely.'<sup>191</sup> Samuel Drybutter, a wealthy jeweller, was reputed to have purchased a house in Pall Mall for the use of sodomitical gentlemen. Several gentlemen were named as frequent visitors to Isaac Hitchen's house in Warrington, suggesting that he may have played a similar role; however, since Hitchen

---

<sup>189</sup> *London Evening Post*, 9-12 March 1751; *St. James' Chronicle*, 30 March – 2 April 1776.

<sup>190</sup> *A Report of the Trial of the Reverend Thomas Jephson, for a Misdemeanor, at the Cambridge Summer Assizes, 1823, on Wednesday, July 23, Before Mr. Serjeant Bosanquet, and a Common Jury*, 1823.

<sup>191</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1726, trial of George Whytle (t17260420-68).

refused to give any names, any firm proof died with him.<sup>192</sup> Similarly, at the White Swan in Covent Garden, “men of rank, and respectable situations in life, might be seen wallowing either in or on the beds with wretches of the lowest description.”<sup>193</sup> ‘Miss’ Fox, a regular at the Swan, had been actively involved in the sodomitical subculture since the age of 12, and was reputed to have been “the darling of a young man of rank” who introduced him to his family as a fellow student, and “in one year, squandered seventeen hundred pounds” on him.<sup>194</sup>

As will be seen in the following chapter, since accusations from servants or apprentices against elite men were more likely to be considered malicious, there was additional safety (as well as a higher chance of success) in approaching men in one’s employ. Captain Henry Allen of the H.M.S. *Rattler*, a man with “Family and Connections which are of the first in England,”<sup>195</sup> was executed on board the H.M.S. *Adventure* on May 15<sup>th</sup>, 1797, for repeated acts of sodomy with two of his servants, Seaman Edward Woodger and Boy James Bonny.<sup>196</sup> Bonny, who could not sign his own name, and was not entirely sure how old he was (he guessed between 14 and 15), was very clear about what the Captain had done to him; Woodger was likewise extremely explicit – both servants reported having been ordered to summon other crewmembers to the Captain’s Cabin in the middle of the night, and some of the Captain’s former servants, who had

---

<sup>192</sup> The attempts of the gentlemen named to discover their accuser, as well as Hitchens’ refusal to reveal any information, are the subject of the bulk of the correspondence in BL Add MS 75900 Althorp Papers vol. dc.

<sup>193</sup> Robert Holloway, “The Phoenix of Sodom, Or, The Vere Street Coterie [1813],” in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy.*, ed. Ian McCormick (London: Routledge, 2000), 188.

<sup>194</sup> Holloway, 190.

<sup>195</sup> ADM 1/5339 (Court Martial of Capt. Allen, 22-24 April 1797), TNA.

<sup>196</sup> ADM 51/1298 (HMS *Adventure* log, 15 May 1797), TNA. The case is discussed in Burg, *Boys at Sea: Sodomy, Indecency, and Courts Martial in Nelson’s Navy*, 94–96.



left his service, reported details of Allen's 'seduction' techniques – according to Thomas Haines, the Captain "laid hold of [his] hand and put it to his Privates." Haines immediately removed his hand, and then "went on the Forecastle and almost fainted away." Richard Creek, another Seaman and former Servant, reported that "at ten o'clock one night at sea, Captain Allen told [him] to bring [his] hammock into his Cabin, and lay it underneath the Cot." After turning out the lights and going to bed, Captain Allen "called Richard in a low voice, took hold of [his] hand and laid it on his [the Captain's] Penis." Creek objected strenuously, and immediately left the Cabin. Allen engaged in almost identical behaviour with both Woodger and Bonny, as well as the commission of sodomy upon their bodies. With Bonny, who was younger and more easily intimidated, Capt. Allen took full use of his ready availability: the Boy deposed that the Captain had once sodomized him every night for seven successive days; and the Ship's Cook, James Burn, reported to the Court that Bonny had told him that "Captain Allen committed Sodomy on him, then frigged him and sucked his yard, and had committed sodomy on him three times in a day."

William Beckford liked to collect beautiful young men as servants, though his biographer claims he was too fearful to attempt anything with them.<sup>197</sup> He writes obsessively about sex; and his letters are 'coarse and libidinous'; but he confines himself to sharing fantasies and complaining about the lack of sexual satisfaction. In 1807, he flirted with the idea of hiring a tight-rope walker named Matthew Saunders to accompany him on a trip to Portugal as a method of seduction. In his instructions, he cautions Franchi not to put himself in any danger on his behalf.

---

<sup>197</sup> Boyd Alexander, *England's Wealthiest Son: A Study of William Beckford* (London: Centaur Press, 1962), 116.

“My dear Gregory,” he pleads, in a letter of the 11<sup>th</sup> of October, “do not expose yourself to any peril – remember me, but at the same time remember the cursed country in which, for my extreme misfortune, I live!”<sup>198</sup> Franchi helped allay Beckford’s loneliness and lust through letters describing attractive young men. Beckford frequently felt that these were not enough to sate his lust; and asked Franchi to provide more details, “otherwise my desperation will lead me to some horrid end.”<sup>199</sup> When he was very desperate, he had Franchi find a youth for him to meet in a cottage in Hounslow<sup>200</sup> but was too frightened of the consequences to do this often.

### ‘We have ... spent too much time on a very disgusting subject’: Disgust and Sodomy in Elite Circles.

In the first few days of September 1772, George III met with members of his Privy Council to decide upon a question which had been the chief source of discussion for the whole of August – whether to offer a pardon to disgraced army officer Robert Jones. George III had previously expressed his desire to see Jones hang, but Jones’ large following of titled defenders, including the Earl of Suffolk (one of the Secretaries of State) and Chief Justice Mansfield were convinced that Jones had been convicted on insufficient evidence.<sup>201</sup> At this meeting, in the words of the *London Evening Post*, the debate had turned into a ‘scene of confusion’, when the King, being

---

<sup>198</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 11 October 1807. Printed in Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 52.

<sup>199</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 1 Nov. 1811. Printed in Beckford, 113.

<sup>200</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 26 August 1812. Printed in Beckford, 132. The brief sexual encounter so refreshed him, however, that he joked to Franchi that his lawyer, ‘Rottier’ (Mr. White) should pimp for him, as a way of stopping his constant expenditures on building projects and works of art. See his letter of 31 August 1812, printed in Beckford, 133.

<sup>201</sup> George III to Lord Suffolk, Kew, 4 Aug. 1772. Printed in Sir John Fortescue, ed., *The Correspondence of King George the Third*, vol. 2 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), 374–75.

appealed to, suddenly stood up and said, “ ‘My Lords, we have already spent too much time upon a very disgusting subject, which I by no means chuse to investigate further; but as many of you seem much better acquainted with these matters than I am, I leave it to yourselves, to determine what ought to be done.’ At these words he walked out of the room, with great dignity, and the meeting broke up immediately after.”<sup>202</sup> Ultimately, Lord Suffolk would get his way – Jones was ‘respite[d] during his Majesty’s pleasure’ on 10 August 1772.

## Censorship and Disgust

King George was not alone in his finding the discussion of the topic of sodomy ‘disgusting’ – whenever sodomy is forced into public consciousness by a key trial, or an accusation against an elite man, disgust is one of the first emotional reactions to which authorities allude. Particularly after 1750, not only is the act itself repulsive, but the mere mention of it evokes disgust. Dictionaries increasingly ceased to define more than obsolete or academic terms for sodomy at all. Of the dictionaries surveyed in this project, Nathan Bailey (1730) defines the most terms: “Ganymede” (he does not define catamite, but includes it in his definition of ganymede), “pederast” and “pederasty”, and “sodomy” and ‘sodomite’.<sup>203</sup> Kersey (1702) and Johnson (1755) do not define any terms at all. Ash (1775) mainly defines words which were largely obscure or obsolete, such as “bardach”, “bardash”, French and Italian words for Indigenous American two-spirited people, which he translates as “catamite”; and the obsolete, medieval term

---

<sup>202</sup> *London Evening Post*, 1-3 Sept. 1772.

<sup>203</sup> Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*, 310, 516, 647.

“bougerons”, or sodomites, taken from Chaucer.<sup>204</sup> Barclay (1792) only defines “catamite”, and did so in a way which implied it was not really applicable to contemporary Britons, as “a person kept by the ancient Romans, and the modern Italians for the vilest of purposes.”<sup>205</sup> Wilkes (1810) gives only one definition which alludes to it, “autocoetesis”, which, if used at all, was in the most limited of academic contexts.<sup>206</sup>

In the legal context, elite men would give as their reason for not fully interrogating witnesses (even with their life on the line!) as not wishing to subject the Court to disgusting testimony. In September of 1785, the Honorable James Adair, Recorder of the City of London, ordered that Mr. Hodgson’s short-hand notes of Roger Sweetman’s trial be burned, as being too disgusting for the public.<sup>207</sup> Mr. Pooley, the prosecuting barrister summing up the case against nine of the men arrested at the White Swan in Vere Street, left all the details of the case to the witnesses, and “carefully abstained from the use of any expression which could offend the chastest ear.”<sup>208</sup> William Cruchley, disgraced midshipman of the H.M.S. *Africaine*, explained in his defence that “it would have been only disgusting you with interrogating them on what was clear as the mid-

---

<sup>204</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 95, 124. He also defines “bugger” and “buggery”, as “to commit an unnatural crime” and “unnatural intercourse” respectively (134). After 1775, while these words continued to apply to male same-sex sexual activity, they generally referred to bestiality.

<sup>205</sup> James Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, New Edition Corrected and Improved (London: Printed for J.F. and C. Rivington, 1792), ccxviii.

<sup>206</sup> John Wilkes, *Encyclopaedia Londinensis; or Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Literature.*, vol. 1 (London: J. Adlard, 1810), 681.

<sup>207</sup> *General Advertiser* (1784), 24 Sept. 1785. The name of the Recorder and Short-Hand writer are taken from the front matter of the Proceedings, *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1785 (t17850914). Luckily, the same was not ordered for the second indictment, for sodomitical assault, and the records of that trial are available. *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1785, trial of ROGER SWEETMAN (t17850914-163); *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1785, trial of ROGER SWEETMAN (t17850914-164).

<sup>208</sup> *Kentish Weekly Journal*, 28 Sept. 1810.

day light, hardly to do more than watch their evidence as it was offered when levelled against me.”<sup>209</sup> At the trial of the Rev. Jephson in Cambridge, the Common Sergeant, who spoke on the defendant’s behalf, observed that, in this case as in many, the magistrate (Mr. Abbot) “would rather forgo the duty of his office, which, under ordinary circumstances, he conscientiously performed than investigate a question which must lead to such horrible, disgusting, and revolting statements.”<sup>210</sup> In his private notes on the subject, Jeremy Bentham was extremely critical of this sort of behaviour. He remarked ironically, “It seems rather too much, to subscribe to men’s being hanged to save the indecency of enquiring whether they deserve it.”<sup>211</sup>

This reticence to mention sodomy extended to translations of ancient works, as well as to new ones. Thomas Cannon’s collection of ancient and modern stories glorifying sodomy caused the author to flee to the Continent, and the publisher (John Purser) to spend time in Newgate Prison.<sup>212</sup> Perhaps aware of the fate of Cannon and Purser, when Floyer Sydenham (1710-1787) published the first English language translation of Plato’s *Symposium*, he took great efforts to ensure that no trace of the sodomitical remained. For example, Achilles became the “admirer” rather than lover of Patroclus,<sup>213</sup> and throughout the text, the Greek word *eromenos* (boy-

---

<sup>209</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Beauchamp-Bruce Court-Martial, 6-15 January 1816), TNA.

<sup>210</sup> *The Times*, 25 July 1823.

<sup>211</sup> Jeremy Bentham, ‘Nonconformity,’ box 740, folio 25, cited in Louis Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love: Homophobia in 19th-Century England* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985), 26. Starting in 1774, Bentham started making notes on the reform of the law; by 1818 he had a 500-page treatise on the issue of ‘sexual irregularity’, and the need to reform the laws. The work was never published in his lifetime. Cf. Jeremy Bentham, *Of Sexual Irregularities, and Other Writings on Sexual Morality*, ed. Philip Schofield, Catherine Pease-Watkin, and Michael Quinn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2014).

<sup>212</sup> Gladfelder, “The Indictment of John Purser, Containing Thomas Cannon’s Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplified.”

<sup>213</sup> Plato, *The Banquet: A Dialogue of Plato Concerning Love.*, trans. Floyer Sydenham, vol. 1 (London: Printed by H. Woodfall, 1761), 57.

beloved), is translated as ‘mistress.’ As Louis Crompton observes, one result of this bowdlerization is the transformation of Phaedrus’ army of lovers, the famous Theban Band “becomes by implication an army of knights and ladies, turning a practical suggestion into a romantic fantasy.”<sup>214</sup> At the end of the *Dialogue*, however, he found himself unable to avoid the speech of Alcibiades, in which he talks of his failure to seduce Socrates. Sydenham apologized for its inclusion, explaining that it is “one of the most essential Parts, without which the Work had been wholly defective in the End for which it was framed.”<sup>215</sup> In the six years between the publication of the first and second parts, he was under great pressure to suppress this speech. Consequently, in the second part he ends the translation with the speech of Socrates, and adds an Advertisement, in which he explains that he was

almost unanimously advised by such of his Friends ... not to publish his Translation of the last Speech in this Dialogue, that of Alcibiades, for fear of the Offence it may reasonably give to the Virtuous from the gross Indecency of some Part of it, the Countenance it may possibly give to the Vicious from the Example of Alcibiades, and the Danger into which it may bring the Innocence of the Young, by filling their Minds with Ideas which it were to be wished they could always remain Strangers to.<sup>216</sup>

This fear, that even mentioning the subject would offend some and give others dangerous ideas would later be raised as a reason both to avoid investigating sodomy cases unless absolutely forced by the situation, and as a reason to exchange time in the pillory for longer jail sentences in

---

<sup>214</sup> Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 90. The passage he is discussing is found in Plato, *The Banquet: A Dialogue of Plato Concerning Love.*, 1:53.

<sup>215</sup> Plato, *The Banquet: A Dialogue of Plato Concerning Love.*, 1:93.

<sup>216</sup> Plato, *The Banquet: A Dialogue of Plato Concerning Love*, trans. Floyer Sydenham, vol. 2 (London: Printed for W. Sandby, 1767), 247.

cases of sodomitical assault.<sup>217</sup> This protection was justified as being essential for the protection of women, children, and the poor and middling sorts. For elite men with a classical education, the curriculum contained many positive examples of sodomitical relationships. Lord Byron later criticized the double standard of calling sodomy ‘the crime not to be named among Christians’, while giving public school-boys a reading list full of stories and examples.<sup>218</sup>

Although details of the crime were considered too disgusting to be mentioned in public, even in legal trials, expression of disgust at the crime often took its place. Gibbon, ostensibly discussing Justinian’s laws on sodomy, is one such example. Despite his professed reluctance to discuss the “odious vice, of which modesty rejects the name, and nature abominates the idea,” Gibbon still manages, over two paragraphs, to express the disgust with which Gibbon, if not the Romans, feel about the subject. Descriptors which follow ‘odious vice’ include “degraded,” “indelible stain,” “licentious,” “impure,” “pollute” and “disease.” Despite Gibbons’ respect for the “purity of his [Justinian’s] motives”, Gibbon is nevertheless critical of the “cruelty of his persecution” – men, particularly the rich, convicted on the ‘slight and suspicious evidence’ of a child or servant, had their penises, “the sinful instrument[s]” cut off, and reeds stuck into “tubes of most exquisite sensibility”, and dragged through the streets to the place of execution.<sup>219</sup> Gibbon was no doubt

---

<sup>217</sup> For the former, see the discussion in the next chapter on official reactions to mass arrests of sodomites in Warrington. For the latter, cf. Jody Greene, “Public Secrets: Sodomy and the Pillory in the Eighteenth Century and Beyond,” *The Eighteenth Century* 44, no. 2/3 (2003): 203–32. For the decrease in public punishment in general, cf. Greg T. Smith, “Civilized People Don’t Want to See That Sort of Thing: The Decline of Physical Punishment in London, 1760-1840,” in *Qualities of Mercy: Justice, Punishment, and Discretion*, ed. Carolyn Strange (Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 1996), 21–51.

<sup>218</sup> *Lord Byron’s Don Juan*, ed. A. Cunningham (Philadelphia: J. B. Smith, 1859), 13.

<sup>219</sup> Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* [1782], ed. David Widger, 1996 Project Gutenberg Edition, vol. 4, 2008, Chapter 44, Parts 7 & 8, [www.gutenberg.org/files/25717/25717-h/25717-h.htm](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/25717/25717-h/25717-h.htm).

thinking of the difficult situation faced by authorities; abhorrence of the crime called for severe punishment, but the risk of wealthy men being destroyed by servants called for caution.

## Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy: The Middling Sorts

The imagination of the writer is not so filled with the idea of reforming that he should suppose it practible totally to suppress whoreing; the consequence of which ... might be the increase of a horrid vice too rife already, though the bare thought of it strikes the mind with horror; possibly the having waste ground, may prevent the *razing the sanctuary and pitching our evils there*, as our excellent poet expresses it.<sup>220</sup>

Saunders Welch, *A Proposal ... to Remove ... Prostitutes from the Streets* (1758)

The two following subsections will consider the discourses regarding lust, disgust and sodomy among the middling sorts. The first subsection will consider lust and sodomy and examine how sodomitical lust became considered so completely estranged from that between men and women, and how some sodomites of the middling sorts used existing frameworks, either by placing the object of lust in the symbolic role of ‘woman’, or as a method of ‘teaching’ the desired one about sex with women, or about manhood. The second subsection will engage with disgust and sodomy, and how the middling sorts expressed moral disgust by associating sodomy with items of disgust – beasts, refuse, garbage, death, rot and decay. This association could be expressed in words, or by physically covering the body of the sodomite with garbage.

---

<sup>220</sup> Saunders Welch, *A Proposal to Render Effectual a Plan to Remove the Nuisance of Common Prostitutes from the Streets of This Metropolis* (London: Printed for C. Henderson, 1758), 19.



## ‘... a Natural Passion for Women, and None for His Own Sex’: Lust and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

When William Bailey was tried for allowing Robert Stimpson to commit sodomy upon him, he brought several witnesses to his passion for women. One of them, Samuel Bevar, told the court that he considered Bailey to have a “natural passion for women, and none for his own sex.”<sup>221</sup>

This ‘defense’, which was used to varying degrees of success, drew upon the popular conception of sodomites as being exclusively drawn to ‘unnatural’ objects. Satires of the sodomite frequently drew upon the idea that sodomites had no interest in women and hated or were disgusted by them. In the *Women’s Complaint to Venus*, a broadside distributed at the pillorying of Capt. Edward Rigby, the women despaired that due to the current popularity of sodomy, they were being deprived of sexual attention:

But now we are quite out of Fashion:  
 Poor Whores may be Nuns  
 Since Men turn their Guns  
 And vent on each other their passion.<sup>222</sup>

Likewise, *The Woman-Hater’s Lamentation*, published in 1707 following a mass arrest of sodomites, emphasized sodomites’ hatred for women (‘Woman you disapprove... and all the Sex Despise’) and that they are all bachelors.<sup>223</sup> Due to this stereotype, many accused sodomites

---

<sup>221</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, October 1761, trial of William Bailey (t17611021-35). Stimpson escaped and was not tried. Despite a bevy of co-workers testifying to his desire for women, Bailey was found guilty; he spent 6 months in Newgate, stood in the pillory, and was to pay a fine of 40s.

<sup>222</sup> Rictor Norton (Ed.) "The Women's Complaint to Venus, 1698", *Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England: A Sourcebook*. Updated 30 April 2013 <<http://www.rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/complain.htm>>.

<sup>223</sup> Randolph Trumbach, ed., "The Woman-Hater’s Lamentation: Or A New Copy of Verses on the Fatal End of Mr. Grant, a Woollen-Draper, and Two Others That Cut Their Throats or Hang’d Themselves in the Counter; with the Discovery of near Hundred More That Are Accused for Unnatural Dispising of the Fair Sex, and Intriguing with One Another [1707]," in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents*, vol. 24, Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England, 1660-1800 (New York: Garland Pub., 1986).

from across the socio-economic spectrum brought out wives, fiancées or girlfriends as an attempt to prove that they could not possibly have been guilty of sodomy. Katherine Maranda swore that John Burgess, tried in 1728, was ‘too fond of a pretty girl, to fall into sodomitical actions.’<sup>224</sup> William Huggins called on his neighbours to show that he was a loving husband, tender father, and a religious man who attended church on Sundays.<sup>225</sup> In the case of Henry Williams, charged with sodomy by his apprentice, Timothy Southern, the sexual relationship with a woman he laid claim to was not even consensual: while in prison, Williams participated in repeatedly raping a woman named Sarah Matts, and his testimony at John Ellis’ rape trial helped both men gain acquittals.<sup>226</sup> Lt. Robert Jones, convicted of sodomy in 1772, had friends testify to his love of women at his trial, and, in the clamour for a pardon, a petition, purportedly from a fiancée (unnamed), was circulated at court. The timing seemed suspect, and many people, including King George III, were not convinced that she even existed.<sup>227</sup>

---

<sup>224</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, October 1728, trial of John Burgess (t17281016-61).

<sup>225</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, December 1730, trial of William Hollywell William Huggins (t17301204-22).

<sup>226</sup> *London Evening Post*, 23-25 March 1731; *Daily Advertiser*, 24 March 1731; *Daily Journal*, 25 March 1731; *Read's Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 27 March 1731; *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, December 1731, trial of John Ellis (t17311208-58). Even though Williams’ testimony shows that Matts’ sexual contact with Williams and others in prison was non-consensual, Ellis used it to prove that Matts was sexually promiscuous, and, thus, that he could not have raped her. Williams in turn used the fact that he had been sexually involved with Matts to show that he could not possibly have molested his apprentice, and the case was dismissed.

<sup>227</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1772, trial of ROBERT JONES (t17720715-22); *London Evening Post*, 28-30 July 1772; George III to Suffolk, 3 Aug. 1772, in *The Correspondence of King George the Third*. Arranged and Edited by Sir John Fortescue. Volume 2. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1927), 374; *Derby Mercury*, 7 Aug. 1772; *Public Advertiser*, 22 Aug. 1772; *London Evening Post*, 25-27 Aug. 1772; *Middlesex Journal*, 3-5 Sept. 1772.

## Taking his Maidenhead: Sodomy and Heteronormative Frameworks

Men of the middling sorts drew upon heteronormative frameworks to express desire and inspire lust. This occurred in both literary depictions of sodomitical encounters and trial accounts. In his novel *The Adventures of Capt. Greenland*, William Goodall describes the encounter between Silvius, companion to the protagonist (Wilful), and a gentleman named Mr. Moggy. Silvius is placed in the position of the innocent girl who catches the eye of the libertine.<sup>228</sup> For Mr.

Moggy, it is lust at first sight – “his *Chops* perfectly water’d; his Observations were *keen* and hungry.” Silvius, completely innocent and insensible “of any such unnatural Passion,” accidentally “encourages” Mr. Moggy by giving a gentle and pleasant Answer to a question asked by the “Lascivious *Cat*.” Despite being married, Mr. Moggy nevertheless fits the common stereotype. He marries for money and has ‘so high a regard’ for his wife, “that very few *Footmen* ever enter’d her *Service* during her whole Life with him, who have not been complimented with his *am’rous* Adresses.”

Moggy pays close attention to Silvius and offers to pay for their supper. The landlord tells them of Moggy’s inclinations, and the three men decide to punish Moggy’s unnatural desires.<sup>229</sup> At supper, Moggy showers Silvius with attention; after supper, he jostles his chair as close to Silvius’ as he can, and addresses him with “the softest, tenderest Terms of Affection.” He also “... privately proceeded to lay his Hand upon *Silvius*’s Thigh, and by gently squeezing of it, gave

---

<sup>228</sup> William Goodall, *The Adventures of Capt. Greenland*, vol. 2 (London: R. Baldwin, 1752), 189.

<sup>229</sup> Goodall, 2:192–94.

him to understand that he had further Hopes in View.”<sup>230</sup> Later, when Wilful and the landlord have left the room, “the am’rous and impatient Mr. Moggy, thrusting his Hand into *Silvius’s* Bosom, (before he had Time either to speak, think, look, or act) snatched him in a Moment to his transported Arms, and ravished a Kiss on his Face.” As will be seen in the following subsection, the consequences for Moggy of these actions are quite severe.

Silvius is clearly playing the role of the ‘girl’ throughout this scene: he is innocent of Moggy’s true intentions; and Moggy attempts to court him throughout the meal. Silvius’ actions are described in typically feminine terms, as ‘coy’ and ‘cold’. All the characters are of the middling sorts: Wilful and Silvius are identified as such earlier in the novel, and Moggy, while identified as a ‘gentleman’, is clearly not a *Gentleman* – he has none of the hallmarks of nobility and is not established as being of an ancient family. While obviously wealthy enough to keep footmen, stables, and postillions, his wealth is identified as belonging to his late wife, “a very pretty and agreeable *Lady* of a *good* Family, and a large Fortune”.<sup>231</sup>

Eight years after the publication of *The Adventures of Captain Greenland*, Richard Branson, a clerk to Mr. Rush, who ran a Vinegar-Yard in Southwark, was convicted of sodomitical assault on James Fassett, a student of Dulwich College in Surrey.<sup>232</sup> In August of 1759, Fasset, then aged 16, was sitting by the school gates around 9 o’clock in the evening, when another student, Edward Bailey (12), came to him with a message from Branson, who was sitting on a bench at

---

<sup>230</sup> Goodall, 2:194–95.

<sup>231</sup> Goodall, 2:190.

<sup>232</sup> *London Evening Post*, 19–22 Jan. 1760. Fassett is occasionally called Fawcett in the newspapers. In the printed report of the trial, he is also called Fasset and Hassett.

the Bell public house across from the school, inviting Fassett to come drink a glass of wine with him. Fassett refused; upon Bailey delivering this message, Branson came over to Fassett himself, and invited him to drink a Glass of Porter with him instead. This Fassett accepted, and, with Bailey and William Cotton (14), went to the public house to drink with Branson. Later Branson observed that it was a fine evening for a walk, and asked Fassett to accompany him, but refused to allow Bailey and Cotton to go too, since “twas not fit for young Children to go with him.”<sup>233</sup>

Having disposed of the younger boys, Branson walked with Fassett to an area called the Grove, which was known for its popularity with lovers.<sup>234</sup> He asked Fassett whether he had ever been with any Girls. Fassett answered that he hadn’t, and that he was not old enough to have such thoughts. Branson told him he was. He then walked arm in arm with Branson, till they came to a private area. Branson then kissed him, and “put his left Hand round my [Fassett’s] Neck, and kissed my lips only; he asked the Name of the Place, I said it was called the Grove, he answer’d ‘twas Love’s Grove; then he kiss’d me again, putting his Tongue in my Mouth; and sucking my Lips, tried to thrust his Right Hand into my Breeches”.<sup>235</sup> Branson made multiple attempts to get his hands down Fassett’s breeches, which Fassett resisted by holding the waistband tight to his body.

---

<sup>233</sup> Randolph Trumbach, ed., “The Trial of Richard Branson, for An Attempt to Commit Sodomy, On the Body of James Fassett [1760],” in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents*, vol. 24, Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England, 1660-1800 (New York: Garland Pub., 1986), 6.

<sup>234</sup> The walkway between Gallery Road and College Road, Dulwich; it was officially called the Grove from 1768, and Grove Walk in the 19th-century. In 2012, Grove Walk was officially named Lovers’ Walk. <https://www.dulwichsociety.com/local-history/465-dulwich-roads-and-place-names>.

<sup>235</sup> Trumbach, “The Trial of Richard Branson,” 7.

The whole of the way back to the College, Branson made repeated attempts to change Fasset's mind. As they walked together out of the Grove, Branson "...asked me ... if I never fr-gged myself; I said I did not know what it meant; he said if I would go back he would learn me."

Later, Branson asked Fasset if he "had [his] Maidenhead" and offered to take it from him.

Branson also inquired whether he could ravish him; although when Fassett told him no, Branson said he would do nothing against his will. At his trial, Branson's only defence was that he was in liquor. He was fined £100, and sentenced to a year's imprisonment in New Gaol, Southwark.<sup>236</sup>

The seduction method of 'teaching' young men about sex was a common one: Robert Jones told Francis Henry Hay (12) that he would show him "how to get a girl with child", before having sex with him.<sup>237</sup> While this part of Hay's information was not brought up at Jones' trial, the

*Gazetteer* included it in their account, claiming that one of the Justices remarked that "he did not think that could be the way."<sup>238</sup> In Bristol, Benjamin Loveday, who kept the Tower Inn,

assaulted his servant Joseph Morgan. The two were in bed together, when Loveday "took him between his legs" and proceeded to sodomize him. Afterwards, Loveday asked Morgan if "no person had served him so before", and, upon Morgan's denial, Loveday told him that he "would never be a Man if some person did not serve him so, for that all Boys were served so."<sup>239</sup>

---

<sup>236</sup> Trumbach, 26.

<sup>237</sup> OB/SP/1772/07/015 (Information of Francis Henry Hay, 14 July 1772), LMA.

<sup>238</sup> *Gazetteer*, 18 July 1772.

<sup>239</sup> JQS/P/68 (Information of Joseph Morgan, 14 July 1781), BPRO. While Morgan's age is not given, he is identified as a minor. JQS/P/68 (Bond of Michael Cronel, 14 July 1781), BPRO.

By figuring the object of lust in the place of a woman, sodomites of the middling sorts worked to figure the sodomitical encounter into existing frameworks for sexuality; by offering it as a learning experience, it placed the relationship in a pedagogical framework, an established framework for men and boys. Likewise, by showing ‘proof’ of sexual interest in women, men accused of sodomy attempted to establish their desires as exclusive of same-sex desire.

### ‘By Crimes a Man, But Else Below a Beast’: Disgust and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

*A nation’s plague, and jest  
By crimes a Man, but else below a beast; ...  
A perfect stranger to the human heart,  
And e’en unnat’ral in the brutal part.  
Thou composition of the vilest kind,  
A loathsome body, and an evil mind.*<sup>240</sup>

This poem, ‘The Voluntary Exile’, was published in the *Morning Chronicle* to protest the upcoming mercy granted to Lt. Jones, for committing sodomy with a 12-year-old apprentice. A week earlier, a coffee-house in Covent Garden was the scene of what the *General Evening Post* called “a whimsical confusion”.<sup>241</sup> As several gentlemen expressed their outrage that ‘such a vice’ could find favour at Court, another man objected to the idea that a man’s life should be forfeit for ‘his particular taste’. As the debate continued, a porter arrived with a letter for Mr. Drybutter. When the man who had defended Jones responded, the company took action to demonstrate their disgust. One man poured his chocolate over Drybutter’s wig. When Drybutter demanded the meaning of this treatment, he was answered, “it is my *particular taste*.” The rest

---

<sup>240</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 1 Sept. 1772.

<sup>241</sup> *General Evening Post*, 22-25 Aug. 1772.

of the company, and several of the staff of the coffee-house then joined in. Another gentleman poured a glass of capillaire down his neck, and a third threw the milk-pot into Drybutter's face, both insisting that this was their 'particular taste.' The barmaid poured a dish of hot coffee down his breeches, and the waiter, an "honest Irishman", kicked his "Old-Bailey" face out of the coffee-house. The noise gathered a mob outside the door, who "immediately knew him, and taking compassion upon his dirty condition, carried him again to the horse-pond in the Meuse, and there sufficiently washed off the milk, capillaire, and chocolate, in that well-known water." Drybutter would suffer again only a few weeks later. Dining on pig in Honey-lane-market, he unfortunately sat at a table where some of the company knew him. They threw a pint of liquor in his face, saying that 'as he loved pig, he should not want for sauce.' The company then forced him to the fire, where "some of them basted him, with the contents of a bountiful dripping-pan, whilst others applied the reeking spit to his nose: greasy dish-clouts in abundance were occasionally made use of, and after rolling him in saw-dust, they suffered him to decamp."<sup>242</sup>

Drybutter suffered for his association with that most unnatural of lusts, sodomy. Particularly in the first episode, his attackers made that connection explicit – making his body the physical embodiment of both desire and uncleanness. Finally, his 'dirty condition' is purified by being washed, not in clean water, but in the filthy horse-pond. In the second situation, he is 'basted' like the pig he was about to eat, and drenched with grease, and the stinking spit was stuffed up his nose. Readers of the *Craftsman* were aware that Leviticus forbade eating the 'unclean' pig, as well as sodomy. Finally, by rolling him in sawdust, used to absorb spilled beer, his body was

---

<sup>242</sup> *Craftsman, or Say's Weekly Journal*, 12 Sept. 1772.



figuratively turned into trash. These events show different ways that the middling sorts expressed their disgust with sodomites. The first, seen in the poem printed in the *Morning Chronicle*, is in the description of the sodomite as being lower or lesser than the animals. The second, seen in the attacks on Mr. Drybutter, was to metaphorically transform the body of the sodomite into a site of disgust, by associating it, either symbolically or in fact, with items of disgust.

## Worse than the Beasts of the Fields: Sodomites as Animals

As Cameron McFarlane observes, “the sodomite is frequently represented as having sunk into a filthy and bestial nature associated with dirt, mire, offal, and animality.”<sup>243</sup> Farid Azfar argues the sodomite, with his beastly lustfulness, was an example of the 18<sup>th</sup>-century fascination with the porous boundary between men and beasts.<sup>244</sup> The discovery of a group of sodomites who blurred the line not only between men and women, but, with their out-of-control lust, between man and beast, was “disturbing and exciting” for the same reasons as the “rabbit-birthing woman or the Wild Boy were: they were utterly strange and utterly true.”<sup>245</sup> It was this disgusted curiosity which led James Dalton to visit several molly houses, that he might “discover

---

<sup>243</sup> Cameron McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire 1660-1750* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 39.

<sup>244</sup> Farid Azfar, “Beastly Sodomites and the Shameless Urban Future,” *The Eighteenth Century* 55, no. 4 (2014): 391–410. This fascination with the line between men and beast has been discussed by several scholars. Cf. Richard Nash, *Wild Enlightenment: The Borders of Human Identity in the Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2003); James Steintrager, *Cruel Delight: Enlightenment Culture and the Inhuman* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2004). For a contemporary account of Peter the Wild Boy, see John Arbuthnot, *It Cannot Rain But It Pours: Or, London Strow’d with Rarities*. (London: J. Roberts, 1726).

<sup>245</sup> Azfar, “Beastly Sodomites and the Shameless Urban Future,” 401.

something of the Intrigues between these Beasts in the Shape of Men.”<sup>246</sup> Sodomites violated the line between men and women, men and beasts; the natural and the unnatural. Since animals, as wild as they are, are ‘natural’, and sodomy is, by definition, ‘unnatural’, sodomites must “*exceed* the very Beasts of the Fields in the Filthiness of their Abominations.” In this ability to destabilize, the sodomite becomes inherently filthy; as Kristeva observes, “filth is not a quality in itself, but it applies only to what relates to a boundary, and, more particularly, represents the object jettisoned out of that boundary, its other side, a margin.”<sup>247</sup> For societies, this disturbing of boundaries and categories is deeply threatening: “the danger of filth represents ... the risk to which the very symbolic order is permanently exposed...”. The socio-religious concepts of pollution, uncleanness, defilement, and taboo emerge as a result of this psychological connection between physical filth, moral disgust, and symbolic systems of order.<sup>248</sup>

---

<sup>246</sup> James Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative of All the Street Robberies Committed since October Last, by James Dalton, and His Accomplices* (London: Printed and sold by J. Roberts, 1728), 36.

<sup>247</sup> Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 69.

<sup>248</sup> Perhaps the strongest example of this is menstrual blood as polluted and even poisonous. While this idea was strongest in the ancient and medieval world, these ideas continued to dominate into the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. Cf. Patricia Crawford, “Attitudes to Menstruation in Seventeenth-Century England,” *Past & Present* 91, no. 1 (1981): 47–73. However, as Sara Read points out, these attitudes were largely dismissed as ignorant myths by the later part of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Sara Read, “‘Only Kept up by the Credulous and Ignorant’: Eighteenth-Century Responses to the Ancient Beliefs about Menstrual Blood,” in *Great Expectations: Futurity in the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. Mascha Hansen and Jurgen Klein, Britannia (Bern: Peter Lang, 2012), 205–22. Church teaching considered sex with a menstruating woman to be unclean (Leviticus 18:19), and Drake reports a widespread belief that menstrual blood would take the skin off a man’s ‘parts’ from mere contact, though he denies this himself. James Drake, *Anthropologia Nova, or, A New System of Anatomy* (London: Printed for Sam. Smith and Benj. Walford, 1707), 321–22.

## ‘Not Discernable as Human Beings’: Filth, Pollution, and Moral Disgust

The above process can be seen in the response to Mr. Drybutter: as a sodomite, his very existence disturbed the symbolic order of society. Drybutter’s body is made to physically reflect its symbolic filth: he is covered with food symbolic of luxury (coffee, chocolate), or uncleanness (pig); he is rolled in sawdust placed on the floor to gather the trash; and he is ritually ‘cleaned’ of his pollution by being dunked in the soiled water from the stables.

Sodomy and sodomites are frequently seen as a type of garbage; a source of pollution; something stinking; refuse to be thrown away. In Reading, when two men were caught in the act of sodomy, one of them was subjected to physical violence rather than being brought before a magistrate.<sup>249</sup>

The one who was caught “underwent the Discipline of the Pump”: cleaning him of his moral filthiness; then “thrown into a Bog-house”, becoming symbolically feces, and then “wash’d in several stinking ditches.”<sup>250</sup> When the servant to a Soap-boiler was caught at an Inn in Thomas

Street, Bristol, making “brutish attempts” on a soldier, the “He-Lady” was turned out of the Inn and pelted with mud and garbage; eventually the Butchers got hold of him, and he was dragged through the filth of the “common Beast Pen” till he nearly suffocated.<sup>251</sup> Silvius, the

protagonist’s companion in *The Adventures of Captain Greenland*, used his fists to “[pummel] the Fire of his amorous Admirer all out of his Heart into his Head; by which means his Nose,

---

<sup>249</sup> Most accounts describe this treatment as happening only to one of the men; however, *Fog’s Weekly Journal* for 5 Oct. 1728 reports both men as being “thrown into a Jakes ... that they might have Nastiness enough.”

<sup>250</sup> *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 5 Oct. 1728. Presumably the other was able to escape.

<sup>251</sup> *Daily Gazetteer*, 25 Jan. 1737.

Mouth, and Eyes, all boiled over with Tears, Blood, and Snivle”; the punishment for having “polluted [Silvius’] Face with a Kiss”.<sup>252</sup> In its coverage of the pillorying of the men of Vere St., the *Morning Post* reported on the sheer amount of disgusting things that were thrown at the “infamous wretches”: offal, dung, rotten apples, potatoes, turnips, cabbage-stalks, bits of dead dogs and cats. The effect of this pelting was to figuratively turn the men into garbage: “Before the cart reached Temple-bar, the wretches were so thickly covered with filth, that ... they were not discernable as human beings.” Cook and Amos, who were forced to stand in the pillory twice as long as their fellows, were “so disfigured... with every kind of filth, that the monsters appeared, what in fact we must suppose them to be, not of the ordinary species of the human race.”<sup>253</sup>

Newspaper accounts of the pillorying of the Vere St. Coterie in 1810 argue against the use of the pillory in cases of this sort – arguing that having these men on display in a public setting will be a source of pollution to innocents. The *Morning Post* observed that it was “dreadful to have female delicacy and manly feeling shocked, and [to] have the infant mind ... polluted by such disgusting spectacles.”<sup>254</sup> The *Morning Advertiser* of the same date suggested that, instead, sodomitical attempts be made a capital crime as a method of avoiding this.<sup>255</sup> In 1825, after a raid in the Strand revived discussion of the Bishop of Clogher, the *Morning Chronicle* explained the problem: if they did not report the case, due to an “unwillingness to pollute our pages with

---

<sup>252</sup> Goodall, *The Adventures of Capt. Greenland*, 2:197.

<sup>253</sup> *Morning Post*, 28 Sept. 1810.

<sup>254</sup> *Morning Post*, 28 Sept. 1810.

<sup>255</sup> *Morning Advertiser*, 28 Sept. 1810.

the revolting subject”, they could be accused of attempting to screen the Bishop from shame due to his rank.<sup>256</sup> The *Scotsman* observed that the Bishop’s presence polluted the country itself.<sup>257</sup>

Sodomites are regularly described as items of disgust – “those Vermin the Sodomites”<sup>258</sup> and contributor ‘A’ considered the (alleged) Dutch practice of drowning a sodomite in a bag with vermin more ‘civilized’ than putting them in the pillory.<sup>259</sup> Sodomy is a “filthy Deed”<sup>260</sup>, “filthy Actions”,<sup>261</sup> “filthy Sins”<sup>262</sup> “a filthy vice”<sup>263</sup>, and “the most filthy and detestable crimes”<sup>264</sup>.

The *Public Ledger* declared the defence of Lt. Jones to be poison,<sup>265</sup> and another commentator considered Jones’s actions to be those of a reptile.<sup>266</sup> Sodomite Marmaduke Tobbs had a “filthy

<sup>256</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 27 Aug. 1825. This accusation had in fact been made. Cf. *Cobbett’s Weekly Political Register*, 43 (3), 228. Cobbett reprints an article from *The Observer Sunday Newspaper*, 21 July 1822.

<sup>257</sup> *Scotsman*, 3 Aug. 1822.

<sup>258</sup> *Daily Gazetteer*, 25 Jan. 1737.

<sup>259</sup> A, “To the PRINTER”, *Gazetteer*, 1 July 1763. Most men sentenced to death for sodomy in the 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Netherlands were strangled, rather than drowned. The few who were drowned were drowned in a barrel, rather than the river. For studies of sodomy in the 18<sup>th</sup>-century Netherlands, cf. Dirk Jaap Noordam, “Sodomy in the Dutch Republic, 1600-1725,” pp. 207-27; Leo Boon, “Those Damned Sodomites: Public Images of Sodomy in the Eighteenth-Century Netherlands,” pp. 237-48; Arend H. Huusen, “Prosecution of Sodomy in Eighteenth-Century Frisia, Netherlands,” pp. 249-62; and Theo van der Meer, “The Persecutions of Sodomites in Eighteenth-Century Amsterdam: Changing Perceptions of Sodomy,” pp. 263-307, all in Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma, *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe* (New York: Haworth Press, 1989); Arend H. Huusen, “Sodomy in the Dutch Republic During the Eighteenth Century,” in *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, ed. Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey (New York: New American Library, 1989), 141-49; Theo van der Meer, “Sodomy and Its Discontents: Discourse, Desire, and the Rise of a Same-Sex Proto-Something in the Early Modern Dutch Republic,” *Historical Reflections* 33, no. 1 (2007): 41-67.

<sup>260</sup> *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 13 Aug. 1726.

<sup>261</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, October 1728, trial of John Bleak Cowland (t17281016-16).

<sup>262</sup> William Arnall, *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Codex [Edmund Gibson]*, The Second Edition (London: Printed for T. Cooper, 1733), 34.

<sup>263</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, October 1761, trial of William Bailey (t17611021-35).

<sup>264</sup> PHILEMOS, “To the Printer of the London Chronicle”, *London Chronicle*, 19 Jan. 1765.

<sup>265</sup> A MAN, “To the Printer of the PUBLIC LEDGER”, *Public Ledger*, 30 July 1772.

<sup>266</sup> MAN, “For the PUBLIC LEDGER”, *Public Ledger*, 13 Aug. 1772.

disposition”.<sup>267</sup> Sodomy is a “revolting vice” practiced by “men of depraved propensities, who feed on what is loathsome and disgusting.”<sup>268</sup> Given this, it is perhaps unsurprising that some sodomites felt themselves to be disgusting. Two days before his execution, David Myers of Peterborough confessed his crimes, and asked that his confession and prayers be made public as a warning to others. He refers to his soul as “polluted” and asks that it may be “pardoned and cleansed” by the hands of his Blessed Saviour.<sup>269</sup>

## Lust, Disgust, and Sodomy: The Poor

In July 1785, after sawyer Richard Read quarrelled with his landlady, he spent the night with Roger Sweetman, who he had known casually for two years. Read fell asleep and woke to Sweetman’s attempting to have sex with him. Read broke Sweetman’s hold, and “gave him two or three good pelts over the head.” After threatening him with further violence if he did such a thing again, Read warned him to keep to his half of the bed and went back to sleep.<sup>270</sup> The next two sub-sections will consider how working and poor Britons negotiated the emotions of lust and disgust in their interactions with sodomy; the uneasy tension between the expectation that their bodies be available, and cultural notions of lust and disgust.

---

<sup>267</sup> *Morning Advertiser*, 14 July 1810.

<sup>268</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 27 August 1825.

<sup>269</sup> D.T. Myers, *The Last Dying Words, Behaviour, and Confession of D.T. Myers, Who Was Executed at Peterborough, on Monday the 4th, of May, for an Unnatural Crime* (Leicester: Pares, 1812).

<sup>270</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1785, trial of ROGER SWEETMAN (t17850914-164).

## ‘He’d go 40 Mile to Enjoy Me’: Lust and Sodomy Among the Poor.

In the spring of 1726, a molly named Mark Partridge led Joseph Sellers, a member of the London SRM, and several other men to several molly houses to gather evidence against sodomites. At one of these,<sup>271</sup> Sellers and Partridge pretended to be Husbands, so in order to prevent Sellers’ “being too far attack’d by any of the Company.” One of the men who approached Sellers was a grocer named Martin ‘Orange Deb’ Mackintosh. Sellers told the Court in July that, after observing Mackintosh and Gabriel Laurence hugging, kissing, and having “employed their Hands in a very vile Manner”, Orange Deb had approached Sellers himself, and “thrust his Hand into my Breeches, and his Tongue into my Mouth, [and] swore that he’d go forty Miles to enjoy me, and beg’d of me to go backwards and let him ...” When Sellers refused to allow Mackintosh to sodomize him in the back room, Mackintosh “pulled down his Breeches and offer’d to sit bare in my Lap.” Seeing his ‘Husband’ being so rudely propositioned, Partridge “snatched a red hot Poker out of the Fire and threatened to run it into his Arse.”<sup>272</sup> On Sellers’ testimony, Mackintosh was found guilty of sodomitical assault and sentenced to stand in the pillory near Bloomsbury Square, to pay a fine of 10 marks, and to suffer one year’s imprisonment.<sup>273</sup> A few months earlier, Gabriel Lawrence and two others convicted at the same time, were visited in prison by the Ordinary of Newgate, who tried to prepare them for their executions. As a critical part of that preparation, he tried to get them to admit their crimes, and acknowledge the justice of

---

<sup>271</sup> The house was called either Tobacco-Roll and Crown, or the Three Tobacco Rolls. It was in Drury Lane.

<sup>272</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1726, trial of Martin Mackintosh (t17260711-53). This case was tried a month before that of Thomas Dalton, but the events of the charge had occurred several months earlier.

<sup>273</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Punishment Summary, July 1726 (s17260711-1).

their sentence. In speaking to Lawrence and the others, he insisted “upon the Villainy and Uncleaness of unnatural Sins, which ought not to be nam’d among People who have any remainders of Civility left, much less among Christians who profess the true Religion, teaching us to deny all Ungodliness and Worldly Lusts &c especially the Lusts of the Flesh.”<sup>274</sup>

As has been seen above, poor men and boys were the most frequent targets of lust for wealthier men. While willing to engage in such acts with wealthy men for money or protection, poor men seeking sodomitical encounters were much more likely to be involved with other poor men.

Gabriel Lawrence was arrested in June 1725 at the house of Margaret Clap, next to the Bunch of Grapes in Field-lane, Holborn. Mrs. Clap provided beds in every room of the house, which usually had at least 30 or 40 men (more on Sundays). Samuel Stephens, another agent of the SRM, deposed to the court at Lawrence’s trial that he had “been there several times, and seen 20 or 30 of ‘em together, making Love, as they call’d it, in a very indecent manner.” Afterwards, “they used to go out by Pairs, into another Room, and at their return, they would tell what they had been doing together, which they call’d marrying.”<sup>275</sup> Lawrence was a milkman; Mackintosh ‘sold oranges’; other sodomites taken at the same time included an upholsterer (Griffin), and a wool-comber (Wright). This is typical of the socio-economic backgrounds of most of the men convicted of sodomy or sodomitical assault in the century that followed: they were bakers, butchers, tailors, soldiers, sailors, and tallow-chandlers.

---

<sup>274</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate’s Account, May 1726 (OA17260509).

<sup>275</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1726, trial of Gabriel Lawrence (t17260420-64).



Outside of molly houses, men who desired other men could still find encounters. In his voluntary confession from the jail at Lancaster Castle, chair-bottomer Thomas Rix described his own initiation into the practice, after drinking with a man named Bromilow at a pub in Manchester,

... Bromilow and this Examinant agreed to go home together – That this Examinant stopt [sic] to make water, and the said Bromilow came up to him and took hold of his yard ... and Examinant at the request of Bromilow took hold of Bromilow's yard, and they used friction with each other till nature spent. Bromilow said there were many other persons who did what they had been doing, and they met at the 'Change at Manchester.<sup>276</sup>

Bromilow also told Rix how to identify others; Rix investigated only a few days later and found it to be true. He would soon learn of other places; men with whom Rix was involved in Manchester told him that others could be found in the Rope Walk at Liverpool.<sup>277</sup> Rix, anxious to gain a pardon (or at least a reprieve) from his upcoming execution, gave as many names as he could. The men he named were servants, Fustian cutters, a broker, an innkeeper, a joiner, a small ware weaver, and 'Callico John', (probably also a weaver).<sup>278</sup>

While the activities Rix described only included acts of mutual masturbation, the account of James Cooper, a private marine of the Portsmouth Division on board the H.M.S. *Africaine*, extended to sodomy itself. According to Cooper's testimony, in April or May of 1815, his first sexual encounter with a man was when fellow marine Rafael Seraco asked Cooper "if he would permit him (Seraco) to f—k him." Cooper claims to have consented without any threat or

---

<sup>276</sup> Add. MS 75900 Althorp Papers, Vol. dc (Examination of Thomas Rix, 15 Sept. 1806), BL.

<sup>277</sup> London had similar locations: Lincoln's Fields, St. James' Park (particularly Bird Cage Walk), Moorfields, and Covent Garden Market were a few of these sites. Cf. Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House*, Chap. 3.

<sup>278</sup> Since Rix confessed only to sodomitical practices, not sodomy itself; and named no men of rank or fortune, his appeal for pardon was denied; he was hanged 27 Sept. 1806.

enticement – the two committed sodomy together by the “foremost Gun next to the Starboard Roundhouse”.<sup>279</sup> Despite the fact that penetration was only achieved “with great difficulty”, it clearly provided Cooper with some pleasure – four or five nights later, he readily consented to sodomy with Seraco again, and once more ten nights after that. Cooper himself proposed sodomy to John Charles, Seaman; they had sex together three times in a fortnight, taking turns in the active and passive roles.<sup>280</sup>

One of the more remarkable aspects of poor sodomitical communities is their relative openness about their activities; an openness expressed by elite or middling sorts only when speaking to poorer men. As has been seen above, among those of similar rank they tend to use euphemisms and allusions, rather than explicit phrases; even Beckford, writing to Franchi in Portuguese, used symbols rather than words to indicate sexual acts. Poor sodomites, when amongst themselves, were able to be open in their discussion. Jonathan Wild relates that, in a house near the end of the Old Bailey, could be found “the men calling one another my Dear, hugging and kissing, tickling and feeling each other, as if they were a mixture of wanton Males and Females...”<sup>281</sup> Stephens’ testimony at the trial of Gabriel Lawrence, quoted above, attests to ‘indecent actions’ performed in the presence of others, as well as open discussion of sexual activities after the fact. At the trial of Margaret Clap for keeping a sodomitical house, he further testified that “when they came out, they used to brag, in plain Terms, of what they had been doing.... The Company talk’d all

---

<sup>279</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of James Cooper, Queen Charlotte, 15 Dec. 1815), TNA

<sup>280</sup> Of the twenty-three men accused of sodomy on board the *Africaine*, four were executed, including both Rafael Seraco and John Charles. Cooper escaped prosecution by turning King’s Evidence.

<sup>281</sup> Jonathan Wild, *An Answer to A Late Insolent Libel* (London: Printed for Tho. Warner, 1718), 30–31.

manner of gross and vile obscenity in the Prisoner's Hearing, and she appeared to be wonderfully pleased with it.”<sup>282</sup>

On board the *Africaine*, many engaged in sodomy within full view of others, and spoke with each other about it. On one occasion, Rafael Seraco caught marine John Parsons in the act with John Westerman: Seraco (who had frequently been involved with Westerman himself), tapped Parsons on the shoulder and told him that “he ought to know better.” Parsons replied, “that it was only one Rogue catching another.” Later, Seraco met Westerman, who told him he was a fool for leaving, when he “might have had the same that Parsons had.”<sup>283</sup> Seraco apparently liked to boast of his relationship with Westerman as a seduction technique; he did so with mizentopman John Clarke, “and asked him at the same time whether he would let him do the like with him.”<sup>284</sup>

## Disgust and Sodomy among the Poor

If we revisit for a moment the reception of Samuel Drybutter at various public and eating houses in the summer and fall of 1772, it is clear that while the expressions of disgust originate from the men of middling sorts, it is quickly taken up by the staff and servants – the bar-maid poured hot coffee down his breeches, and it was the waiter, an Irishman, who threw him out of the establishment. However, several trial accounts suggest that this was not the only reaction of

---

<sup>282</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1726, trial of Margaret Clap (t17260711-54).

<sup>283</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Statement of Raphael Seraco, on board the *Africaine* at Sea, 2 Nov. 1815), TNA.

<sup>284</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of John Clarke, *Queen Charlotte*, 13 Dec. 1815), TNA.

poorer men and women when dealing with cases of sodomy; they often displayed a lack of disgust which confused and worried the men of the bench.<sup>285</sup>

## A Qualified Tolerance: Poverty, Sodomy and the Lack of Disgust

In 1732, the Court at the Old Bailey saw a most peculiar twist on a common scene when John Cooper prosecuted a young man from his neighbourhood named Thomas Gordon for stealing his clothes. In the course of the trial, it was revealed that the prosecutor was known around the neighbourhood as the Princess Seraphina. Jane Jones, a washer-woman in Drury-lane, and Mary Poplet, the landlady of the Two Sugar-Loaves in the same street, only knew the prosecutor as the Princess, and referred to her entirely in female pronouns; Mary Robinson testified that they used the same Mantua Maker, and that Cooper frequently shared dresses with a Mrs. Green. Despite the evidence of a friendly relationship between Cooper and the neighbourhood women, they appeared as witnesses for the defence; they knew by giving details of Cooper's proclivities, the Court would believe Gordon's story – that Cooper had given him the clothes to avoid prosecution for sodomitical practices. They were successful, and Gordon was acquitted of the crime.<sup>286</sup> The Princess Seraphina may have been a source of amusement, but 'she' was not truly a part of the community.

In June 1761, a free black sailor named Charles Ferret, sleeping on the deck of the H.M.S. *Ocean*, woke to the sound of a body 'blowing and puffing' alongside of him, the very motion of

---

<sup>285</sup> This decreased over time, with the spread of evangelical religion and the increasing tendency to turn to police rather than resorting to rough acts of community justice.

<sup>286</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1732, trial of Thomas Gordon (t17320705-30).

which was shaking him. Startled, he reached out with his left hand, and quickly grabbed the man's testicles – stopping him in the middle of committing sodomy upon the boy in his bed. From the sound of his voice, and from his hair, Ferret quickly identified his shipmate George Newton. Telling him that he was “worse than the Beasts in the Field”, Ferret shouted as loud as he could that he had found a man bugging a boy. No one came, but several of the men of the *Ocean* testified to having heard Ferret call out and telling Newton repeatedly that he was worse than the beasts. Ferret kept the boy, Finley, secured in his bunk, and, together with the men who had heard the accusations in the night, brought both men to Lt. William Orfeur. Newton was put in irons immediately, and, upon Finley's admitting that he had allowed men to commit sodomy with him in St. James' Park, he was placed in irons as well. When Captain Langdon returned to the ship, he immediately requested a court martial. Newton and Finley were tried on board the *Princess Royal* on the 2 July 1761 and hanged from her on the 27<sup>th</sup>. Finley, a London boy, had only joined the Navy on June 15; he died aged only fifteen-years.<sup>287</sup> Ferret was clearly disgusted by what he witnessed: the sounds of Newton's breath, the motion of his body; and Ferret's constant repetition of the phrase, “you are worse than the beasts of the field.”; disgust permeates his testimony. However, the fact that so many of the men of the *Ocean*, while they heard Ferret's outcry, did not bother to get up out of bed,<sup>288</sup> suggests that they were willing to let it be, if it did not directly affect them.

---

<sup>287</sup> ADM 1/5300 (Newton-Finley CM, 2 July 1761), TNA.

<sup>288</sup> The cook, George Dawson, did get out of bed; he was going to investigate, but his wife told him to leave it until morning. TNA ADM 1/5300 (Newton-Finley CM, 2 July 1761), TNA.

Part of this relative indifference was due to the relatively relaxed attitudes towards sexuality experienced by the labouring sorts. Extensive demographic studies by scholars such as Peter Laslett, Lawrence Stone and Richard Adair have shown a substantial rise in rates of illegitimacy over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, growing from 1.7% of all births in the late seventeenth-century to approximately 3% by 1750, and doubling again by the start of the 19th century.<sup>289</sup> Historians have proffered various theories for this change, Laslett suggesting a ‘bastardy prone sub-society’; other hypotheses include changes in sexual practice resulting from shifting attitudes towards penetrative sex, and conjugal courtship customs which delayed or thwarted marriages due to changing socioeconomic circumstances.<sup>290</sup> Historians such as Tim Hitchcock, Thomas Lacqueur, Randolph Trumbach and Famerz Dabhoiwala argue that changes in sexual behavior became increasingly focused on penetration, displacing activities such as mutual masturbation.<sup>291</sup> Other historians, such as Peter Laslett, Richard Adair, and Nicholas Rogers have used parish and court records to show that most couples engaged in penetrative sex with the intention of marrying, but failed to do so (largely due to economic issues) when pregnancy

---

<sup>289</sup> Peter Laslett, *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations: Essays in Historical Sociology* (Cambridge University Press, 1977); Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*; Peter Laslett, Karla Oosterveen, and Richard Michael Smith, eds., *Bastardy and Its Comparative History: Studies in the History of Illegitimacy and Marital Nonconformism in Britain, France, Germany, Sweden, North America, Jamaica and Japan* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1980); Richard Adair, *Courtship, Illegitimacy, and Marriage in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996). The statistics are taken from Laslett, Oosterveen, and Smith, *Bastardy and Its Comparative History*, 14.

<sup>290</sup> Laslett, *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations*, 105–7; John R. Gillis, *For Better, for Worse: British Marriages, 1600 to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 128, 219; Adair, *Courtship, Illegitimacy, and Marriage in Early Modern England*, 15–16, 79; Rebecca Probert, ed., *Cohabitation and Non-Marital Births in England and Wales, 1600-2012* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

<sup>291</sup> Thomas W. Laqueur, “Sex and Desire in the Industrial Revolution,” in *The Industrial Revolution and British Society*, ed. Patrick K. O’Brien and Roland Quinault (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 100–123; Tim Hitchcock, “Redefining Sex in Eighteenth-Century England,” *History Workshop Journal* 41, no. 1 (1996): 72–90; Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*; Dabhoiwala, *Origins of Sex*.

occurred.<sup>292</sup> Looking outside of England, studies on Scotland and Wales have found some interesting regional differences, but roughly follow the same pattern as England.<sup>293</sup> Levels of illegitimacy in Wales, for example, were consistently higher than in England, even without the economic stresses of the industrial revolution.<sup>294</sup>

## Sodomy for Fun and Profit: Prostitution, Theft, and Poor Men.

As Tim Hitchcock has shown, the beggarly poor were used to exchanging physical labour for economic support.<sup>295</sup> Many young women made use of the perception that they were sexually available in order to supplement their income; men engaged in all sorts of unpleasant and dangerous tasks, dealing with garbage, refuse, and back-breaking labour: from the number of poor men in sodomy trials who were willing to trade sex for money, it is clear some found sexual labour to be considerably easier. As we saw above, Edward Courtney reported that he had frequently worked as a prostitute out of George Whittle's molly-house and that Whittle had frequently served as his pimp, supplying him with wealthy clients to "marry."<sup>296</sup> Others, when approached by sodomites, agreed to sex in exchange for food, clothes, or alcohol. In 1722,

---

<sup>292</sup> Laslett, Oosterveen, and Smith, *Bastardy and Its Comparative History*; Nicholas Rogers, "Carnal Knowledge: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Westminster," *Journal of Social History* 23, no. 2 (1989): 355–75; Adair, *Courtship, Illegitimacy, and Marriage in Early Modern England*.

<sup>293</sup> Andrew Blaikie, *Illegitimacy, Sex, and Society: Northeast Scotland, 1750-1900* (Clarendon Press, 1993); Rosalind Mitchison and Leah Leneman, *Sin in the City: Sexuality and Social Control in Urban Scotland 1660-1780* (Newbattle, UK: Scottish Cultural Press, 1998); Rosalind Mitchison and Leah Leneman, *Girls in Trouble: Sexuality and Social Control in Rural Scotland 1660-1780* (Newbattle, UK: Scottish Cultural Press, 1998); Angela Joy Muir, "Courtship, Sex and Poverty: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Wales," *Social History* 43, no. 1 (2017): 56–80.

<sup>294</sup> Muir, "Courtship, Sex and Poverty: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Wales," 61.

<sup>295</sup> Tim Hitchcock, *Down and Out in Eighteenth-century London* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2004).

<sup>296</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1726, trial of George Whytle (t17260420-68).

coachman John Dicks plied dyer John Meeson with alcohol from several different public houses; each time Dicks suggested they engage in sexual acts, Meeson refused, but agreed to be bought more alcohol or food, until finally he was so drunk that he passed out on the bed of the private room Dicks arranged for them. Unfortunately for Dicks, he was observed attempting to have sex with Meeson (the landlady and several gentlemen were watching through a keyhole); Dicks was convicted of assault with intent to commit sodomy.<sup>297</sup> As seen above, Richard Branson provided alcohol not only for James Fassett, but for his classmates as well. On board the *Africaine*, Raphael Seraco offered John Clarke a new pair of shoes if he would agree to sodomy,<sup>298</sup> and cook Rafaelo Troyac (called Treake) continually bribed the boys and young men of the ship with tidbits of meat and deserts left over from the Officers' mess. As he observed to Raphael Seraco, "the best way to serve an Englishman is to give him Cakes and fuck him."<sup>299</sup>

In other cases, this income could be supplemented with blackmail or theft. The source of much of James Dalton's information about the gatherings and strange rituals of the mollies was a man who went by the name of Susannah 'Sukey' Haws – Dalton is quick to assure his readers that Haws is not a sodomite, but one who takes advantage of them for financial gain.<sup>300</sup> "He was neither a downright Pick-pocket, a downright Sodomite, or a downright *Bug*, tho' a part of every

---

<sup>297</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1722, trial of John Dicks (t17220404-29); their occupations are given in the *Daily Journal*, 19 and 27 April 1722.

<sup>298</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of John Clarke, *Queen Charlotte*, 13 Dec. 1815), TNA. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

<sup>299</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of Rafaelo Seraco, *Queen Charlotte*, 14 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>300</sup> Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative*, 33.



one of them.”<sup>301</sup> One of the sodomites identified by Dalton, a young man named James “Miss Kitten” Oviat,<sup>302</sup> seems not to have been above exploiting his partners for money – he was twice convicted of extortion (in 1726 and 1728), standing each time in the pillory and sentenced to a total 9 months in Newgate.<sup>303</sup> Mark Partridge, AKA “Small Coal Moll”, one of the evidences against Gabriel Lawrence and Thomas Wright (both executed for sodomy in 1726), was convicted a few years later of extorting money from Edward Dogan by threatening to accuse him of sodomitical practices.<sup>304</sup> In some cases, as of that of twenty-one-year old William Morris, cases that wound up with blackmail or robbery likely started as sexual encounters: according to the prosecutor, Jonathan Birk, Morris began the encounter with sodomitical solicitations, even putting his hand into Birk’s breeches; when Birk refused, Morris attacked him, threatening to cut his throat with a knife if he did not give him money. While Morris never admitted guilt, he told the Ordinary of Newgate that it was piece of pottery, not a knife; the Ordinary took this as a partial confession.<sup>305</sup>

---

<sup>301</sup> Dalton, 34.

<sup>302</sup> Dalton, 37.

<sup>303</sup> *Evening Post*, 9-11 June 1726; *Daily Post*, 10 June 1726; *British Journal*, 11 June 1726; *London Journal*, 11 June 1726; *Ipswich Journal*, 20 Jan. 1727; *Daily Post*, 10 Jan. 1728; *Country Journal (Craftsman)*, 13 Jan. 1728; *London Journal*, 13 Jan. 1728; *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 27 Jan. 1728; *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, February 1728, trial of James Oviat (t17280228-82); *London Evening Post*, 7-9 March 1728; *Daily Post*, 9 March 1728; *Stamford Mercury*, 14 March 1728; *Daily Journal*, 26 March 1728; *Daily Journal*, 27 March 1728; *Daily Post*, 27 March 1728; *British Journal (the Censor)*, 30 March 1728; *Country Journal (Craftsman)*, 30 March 1728; *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 30 March 1728.

<sup>304</sup> *London Daily Post*, 3 Sept. 1735; *General Evening Post*, 21-23 Oct. 1735; *London Evening Post*, 21-23 Oct. 1735; *Country Journal (Craftsman)*, 25 Oct. 1735; *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 25 Oct. 1735; Middlesex Sessions: Sessions Papers- Justice’s Working Documents, 17<sup>th</sup> October 1735, *London Lives*, LMSMPS503120014-15; Middlesex Sessions Papers, Justice’s Working Documents, 18<sup>th</sup> October 1735, *London Lives*, LMSMPS503120150-51.

<sup>305</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, December 1752, trial of William Morris (t17521206-21); *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate’s Account, February 1753 (OA17530212).

## Conclusion

In 1812, after being cut off from the continent (and the possibility of sexual fulfillment) for nearly a decade, William Beckford took the risk of asking his secretary and agent Gregorio Franchi to find an available young man, and a cottage in Hounslow. Hounslow at the time was largely an open field, where large quantities of manure and vegetable waste were dumped. While the anticipation of sexual intimacy and connection filled him with joy, he was aware of the less than wholesome surroundings the need for secrecy required. Writing to Franchi, he observed ironically that "... no place will do me so much good as the hot sands of Hounslow (so healthy! so pure!)."<sup>306</sup>

This chapter has considered the role of lust and disgust in 18th-century responses to sodomy. Theoretical understandings of lust as excessive desire inherently included the sodomitical, and as understandings of heterosexual lust became increasingly liberated from the restraints of the 17th century, same-sex sexual behaviors increasingly became recognized as 'sodomy', and thus sinful and disgusting. Early concepts of disgust, as an emotional purgative to encounters with evil carried through in societal reactions to sodomy. For elites, the subject became a taboo; something shameful, that could not be discussed outside of euphemism and metaphor. For the middling sorts, sodomitical lust was frequently disguised by imitating existing relational frameworks, though opposition to sodomy was often framed as being in defence of those relationships. Disgust

---

<sup>306</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 31 August 1812, printed in Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 133. In an earlier letter to Franchi (26 August 1812), Beckford alludes to the true purpose of the trip to Hounslow, disguising it in architectural metaphors.

was expressed through transference – moral disgust was made physical by treating the sodomitical body as garbage. Finally, unlike men of the elite and middling sorts, poorer sodomites tended to combine love and sex, rather than separating them; they were assisted in this by a (relative) lack of disgust from others in their communities. This tolerance was tenuous, however, and highly dependant on the situation. When directly confronted with the subject or given encouragement from those of the elite and middling sorts, the poor were quite willing to express their disgust for the figure of the sodomite.

## Chapter 2

### Love and Hatred

*He denied the murder to the last, owned the sodomy, and on the Monday before he was executed, gave Lincoln 2 sixpences, & other odd things, and told him, tho' he died for him, 'he loved him to the last'.*

Rev. Francis Blomefield on the execution of Robert Carlton, 1742.<sup>307</sup>

On April 5<sup>th</sup>, 1742, the small market-town of Diss, Norfolk, witnessed the execution of tailor Robert Carlton. He was hanged for sodomy with John Lincoln, and the murder of Lincoln's fiancée. Carlton was born about 1697 to "very honest Parents", who gave him the best education they could afford, and apprenticed him to a tailor. However, at the expiration of his apprenticeship, "he was led astray by a company of Sodomites, which unnatural Practice he followed ever after."<sup>308</sup> For more than twenty years, despite being "notoriously guilty," Carlton continued to live and work in Diss without prosecution, or any complaints made against him.

In his forties, he fell in love with John Lincoln, who became his "lodger and bed-fellow." The two lived together for "a considerable Time", during which Lincoln was "entirely kept by him."<sup>309</sup> Eventually, Lincoln got tired of living a secret life, and began courting a woman named Mary Frost, bringing her several times to their home.<sup>310</sup> Carlton grew angry, and told Lincoln that "if he brought his Whores near him he would do them some Mischief ..., nay swore he

---

<sup>307</sup> Gough Norfolk 43 (Diss pages), Bod.

<sup>308</sup> "The Life, Parentage, Education, and Conversation of Robert Carlton; who was EXECUTED upon Diss Common, on Monday April the 5<sup>th</sup> 1742" (n.d); preserved in Gough Norfolk 43, Bod.

<sup>309</sup> *London Evening Post*, 23-25 March 1742.

<sup>310</sup> *Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal*, 27 March 1742.

would poison them.”<sup>311</sup> When Mary Frost became ill and died within a day of eating dinner at Carleton’s house, Lincoln went to the authorities.<sup>312</sup>

Among the 10000 people who congregated on Diss Common to watch Carlton’s execution was the Rev. Francis Blomefield, Rector of nearby Fersfield.<sup>313</sup> Blomefield reports that Carlton gave Lincoln numerous small items, including his tailors’ tools, and that they drank together the night before Carlton’s execution, and parted as friends. Supposedly, the last thing Carlton told Lincoln was that he still loved him, even though his testimony condemned him.<sup>314</sup> The Sunday before he was hanged, Carlton was carried in chains to Diss church, where he heard the sermon from his usual pew. Following his execution, Carlton’s body was carried back to his house, where visitors were charged two-pence apiece to view the body. The next day, his corpse was hung in chains on Diss Common, to warn others of the dangers of sodomy.<sup>315</sup>

The tragic fate of Robert Carlton and John Lincoln demonstrates the interplay of love and hatred: Carlton’s rash action in murdering Mary Frost was understood as occurring out of love, as well as malice and revenge; the disrespect dealt to Carlton’s body can be contrasted with his having been (relatively) tolerated among the people of Diss for twenty years. Similarly, Lincoln’s betrayal of his lover, and Carlton’s forgiveness, shows how, for sodomites, love was always laced with danger; friends and lovers could easily become the source of one’s downfall.

---

<sup>311</sup> *London Evening Post*, 23-25 March 1742.

<sup>312</sup> Gough Norfolk 43.

<sup>313</sup> David Stoker, “The Tailor of Diss: Sodomy and Murder in a Norfolk Market Town,” *Factotum* 31 (1990): 20.

<sup>314</sup> Gough Norfolk 43.

<sup>315</sup> Newspaper clipping, dated 3 April 1742 [probably the *Norwich Gazette*], Gough Norfolk 43.

When Lucien Febvre made his call for a history of emotions in 1941, he called for a ‘history of hate, a history of fear, a history of cruelty, a history of love.’<sup>316</sup> Two of those emotions, hate and love, are among the most powerful of human experiences. This chapter will consider the emotions of love and hate – how they were understood by British society in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century, and how they shaped the discourse on sodomy and sodomites.

## Love, Hatred and the Academy

There are few emotions that are as deeply imbedded in the cultural imagination as love and hatred. Love has had considerably more of a focus than hatred, and earlier: it was a key aspect of many of the early histories of marriage and the family.<sup>317</sup> The problem with many existing studies is that they compartmentalise love. As Simon May observes, modern Western culture tends to distinguish ‘Eros-love’(passionate desire which looks for sexual intimacy and union with the loved one) from friendship-love (temperate, just and reciprocal devotion to another person who is a ‘second self’), and both from love as self-giving (usually associated with the love of parents for their children or charity to strangers), and devotion to God. For May, this conceptualization creates false distinctions between different degrees and aspects of a single emotion.<sup>318</sup>

---

<sup>316</sup> Lucien Febvre, “La sensibilité et l’histoire: Comment reconstituer la vie affective d’autrefois?,” *Annales d’histoire sociale* 3, no. 1/2 (1941): 19. Translation mine.

<sup>317</sup> Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*; Randolph Trumbach, *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*, Studies in Social Discontinuity (New York: Academic Press, 1978); Gillis, *For Better, for Worse*.

<sup>318</sup> May, *Love*, 25.

Following this, studies of love have tended to be either about sexual/romantic love, or about family, or about friendship.<sup>319</sup> With some key exceptions discussed below, current studies are usually heteronormative: the emotion identified as ‘love’ (therefore romantic and sexual) between members of the opposite sex, becomes ‘friendship’ (therefore lesser and non-sexual) when between members of the same-sex. Friendships between men and women have rarely been studied at all, and when they are, the friendships in question are between siblings, or epistolary friendships between a male scholar/author/politician and an elite female.<sup>320</sup>

Literary scholars and historians of homosexuality have worked to erase some of the distinctions between love (sexual) and friendship (platonic). Using correspondence, George Haggarty shows that elite male friendships were based on shared interests and experiences rather than proximity.<sup>321</sup> George Rousseau points to historically important forms of same-sex relationships such as discipleship and the tutor-student relationship, which could be “an existential hotbed for intense friendship.”<sup>322</sup> Historian Alan Bray rejects the modern inability to conceive of loving relationships with non-family members in other than sexual terms, and argues that the obsession

---

<sup>319</sup> The exception to this is in studies of the family, which often include discussions of romantic/sexual love between the married couple, and parental/filial love with the resulting children.

<sup>320</sup> Amy Harris, *Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012). Studies of friendships between men and women are more common for the Continent and the United States; cf. Cassandra A. Good, *Founding Friendships: Friendships between Men and Women in the Early American Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Lewis Carl Seifert and Rebecca May Wilkin, eds., *Men and Women Making Friends in Early Modern France* (London: Routledge, 2016).

<sup>321</sup> George E Haggerty, *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); George E Haggerty, *Horace Walpole's Letters: Masculinity and Friendship in the Eighteenth Century* (Lanham: Bucknell University Press, 2011), 15.

<sup>322</sup> George Rousseau, “‘Homoplatic, Homodepressed, Homomorbid’: Some Further Genealogies of Same-Sex Attraction in Western Civilization,” in *Love, Sex, Intimacy and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*, ed. Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 24.

with sexuality obscures other forms of romantic and love relationships.<sup>323</sup> Bray contends that erotic friendship was more easily expressed prior to the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, when the growing association of sodomy with particular acts rather than irreligion and witchcraft led to increasing suspicion of intimate male friendships. He shows how, during the early modern period, many men considered their friendships as the equivalent to marriage: he draws on liturgical ceremonies for ‘wedded brothers’, as well as gravesites where the friends were buried together. These joint graves largely disappear after the first few decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Studies on hatred as a concept in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century have been remarkably few. Hatred is usually studied in relation to hatred of minorities: religious, racial, and sexual.<sup>324</sup> Studies on homophobia have largely been dominated by a single narrative: one where an increasingly intolerant culture moves lockstep with an increasingly juridical state leading to a rise in persecution and prosecution of sodomites in the 18th century. This narrative of “a homophobic fear of effeminacy lead[ing] to state-sponsored ‘pogroms’ against sodomites”<sup>325</sup> begins with Randolph Trumbach’s seminal 1977 article, in which he argues that popular portrayals of sodomites were always of the effeminate molly, and that this “... threatened the boundaries of

---

<sup>323</sup> Bray, *The Friend*, 6.

<sup>324</sup> For example Frank Felsenstein, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830*, Johns Hopkins Jewish Studies (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995). On homophobia, see Louis Crompton, “Homophobia in Georgian England,” in *Among Men, Among Women: Sociological and Historical Recognition of Homosocial Arrangements*, ed. Mattias Duyves et al. (Amsterdam: Grafisch Centrum Amsterdam, 1983), 235–44; Byrne Fone, *Homophobia: A History*, 1st ed (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000); Mary L. South, “Homophobia in Eighteenth Century Southampton,” *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archeological Society* 66 (2011): 187–200.

<sup>325</sup> Farid Azfar, “Genealogy of an Execution: The Sodomite, the Bishop, and the Anomaly of 1726,” *Journal of British Studies* 51, no. 3 (July 2012): 569.



culture.”<sup>326</sup> In subsequent work, Trumbach makes the connection between these portrayals and patterns of punishment explicit, arguing that sodomites were “members of a third gender that deserved to be treated with contempt. They were hanged in the few cases where anal penetration and seminal emission could be proven.”<sup>327</sup> Laurence Senelick, while disagreeing with many of Trumbach’s conclusions, also ties the spike in prosecutions with increased cultural intolerance.<sup>328</sup>

Running parallel to this narrative of state repression is that of ‘pogroms’ against sodomites, starting in the 1690s and peaking in the 1720s. Farid Azfar argues that this narrative was caused by the misuse of the word ‘pogrom’ to describe the actions of the SRM.<sup>329</sup> Alan Bray was the first to use the term in this context<sup>330</sup>; subsequent historians, such as Anthony Simpson, Netta Goldsmith, and Cynthia Herrup, have continued to use the word, citing Bray.<sup>331</sup> Louis Crompton does not use the word itself, but describes the British views as increasingly repressive, with sodomy seen as “a menace to be extirpated by draconian measures.”<sup>332</sup> As Azfar points out, the word ‘pogrom’, originally applied to the Warsaw pogrom of 1881, describes “popular,

---

<sup>326</sup> Trumbach, “London’s Sodomites,” 13.

<sup>327</sup> Trumbach, “Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London,” 190. He repeats these same lines, nearly verbatim, in his subsequent work, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*, 8. Trumbach corrects ‘they were hanged’ to ‘some were hanged’.

<sup>328</sup> Senelick, “Mollies or Men of Mode? Sodomy and the Eighteenth-Century London Stage,” 50.

<sup>329</sup> Azfar, “Genealogy of an Execution,” 540.

<sup>330</sup> Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 91.

<sup>331</sup> Antony E. Simpson, “Masculinity and Control: The Prosecution of Sex Offences in Eighteenth-Century London” (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1984); Netta Murray Goldsmith, *The Worst of Crimes: Homosexuality and the Law in Eighteenth-Century London* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1998); Herrup, *A House in Gross Disorder*.

<sup>332</sup> Louis Crompton, *Homosexuality and Civilization*, First Harvard University Press paperback edition (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 451.

spontaneous, moblike attacks on Jews and their communities, including those that occurred in premodern Europe.” In the historiography of sodomy, however, it “seems to support throwaway allusions to ‘state repression’... everything begins and ends with the fear of effeminacy: prosecutions suggest an intolerance for effeminacy; intolerance explains an apparent enthusiasm for prosecution. Not much room is left for an alternative explanation.”<sup>333</sup> Azfar, following Tim Hitchcock, questions the degree of state control over the judicial system in this narrative.<sup>334</sup> As will be seen below, while the accusations of ‘state repression’ are greatly exaggerated, the traditional definition of “popular, spontaneous, moblike attacks on Jews and their communities” is very much applicable to the situation of sodomites in 18<sup>th</sup>-century Britain.

While the culture-state-law connection continues to dominate the historiography, it has not gone completely unchallenged. This narrative has also been questioned from other angles. Several scholars have queried whether effeminacy was always seen as sodomitical, or a reason for prejudice. Philip Carter challenges the assumption that theatrical effeminacy was always read as sodomitical by 18th-century audiences;<sup>335</sup> and several essays in Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen’s *English Masculinities* deal with behaviours and interests that were considered effeminate but not (necessarily) sodomitical.<sup>336</sup> Steve Poole argues that, portrayals aside, not all

---

<sup>333</sup> Azfar, “Genealogy of an Execution,” 570.

<sup>334</sup> Hitchcock, *English Sexualities, 1700-1800*; Azfar, “Genealogy of an Execution.”

<sup>335</sup> Carter, “Men About Town: Representations of Foppery and Masculinity in Early Eighteenth-Century Urban Society.”

<sup>336</sup> Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen, “Introduction,” in *English Masculinities, 1700 -1800*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999), 5. Cf. Michele Cohen, “Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England”, 44-62; Jeremy Gregory, “*Homo religious*: masculinity and religion in the long eighteenth-century,” 85-110; Philip Carter, “James Boswell’s Manliness”, 111-130; Robert Shoemaker, “Reforming male manners: public insult and the decline of

sodomites were effeminate, and that, for Bristolians in the 1730s-50s, hatred of sodomites owed to the fact that they could not be easily identified. “Sodomites were ‘devils in human shape’; respectable on the outside but ruinous within.”<sup>337</sup>

Whether it was sponsored by the state, or the state was merely responding to popular prejudice; whether the popular prejudice was motivated by fear of effeminacy, or something else; the original meaning of the term pogrom, popular, spontaneous, moblike attacks, certainly applies to the treatment of sodomites in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. In between outbursts of violence and vitriolic expressions of hatred, however, was tacit toleration, friendship, and even love.

## Love and Hatred in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Thought

Love is a propension of the mind towards any thing, absent or present, arising from the Delight, which it is apt to produce in us. Hatred is an aversion to any thing, absent or present, arising from the thought of the pain or disgust, which it is apt to produce in us.

Edward Bentham, *Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, 1746.<sup>338</sup>

One of the problems with love is that the word is terribly imprecise. As John Norris observed, the word is “Equivocal and full of Latitude ... It is given to things whose Ideas are Notoriously different...”<sup>339</sup> John Kersey defined love as “amity, affection or kindness;”<sup>340</sup> and Nathan Bailey as “kindness, friendship; a passion.”<sup>341</sup> Samuel Johnson gave no less than fourteen

---

violence in London, 1660-1740”, 133-150; and Elizabeth Foyster, “Boys will be boys? Manhood and aggression, 1660-1800”, 151-166, in the same volume.

<sup>337</sup>Poole, ““Bringing Great Shame upon This City.””

<sup>338</sup> Edward Bentham, *An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*., The second edition. (Oxford: Printed at the Theater for James Fletcher, 1746), 14.

<sup>339</sup> John Norris, *The Theory and Regulation of Love* (Oxford: Printed at the Theatre for Hen. Clements, 1688), 8–9.

<sup>340</sup> Kersey, *A New English Dictionary*, 1702.

<sup>341</sup> Nathan Bailey, *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (London: Printed for J.J. and P. Knapton, 1735).

meanings to the word at mid-century, encompassing everything from sexual intercourse to a mild fondness.<sup>342</sup> John Ash provided a similarly large range of definitions, including tenderness, affection and kindness; spiritual love of God, and the “passion between the sexes.”<sup>343</sup> Barclay defined the verb *to love*, as “a passion that combines affection and desire”; as a noun, the ardent desire for an amiable object, divided into two ‘species’: friendship and desire.<sup>344</sup>

The problem with hatred stemmed from its social and moral effects. Religious thinking emphasized both God’s command to love one’s neighbour and the obligation of the righteous to hate God’s enemies. At the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, there were two dominant arguments concerning hatred: the first saw it as the opposite of love, ripping society apart. The second argument saw hatred’s essential nature as companionate with love. Sylvester Jenks in 1702 considered hatred of evil a part of love.<sup>345</sup> Meanings for ‘hatred’ in contemporary dictionaries reflected these two aspects as well. Nathan Bailey focused on the social aspects, defining it as “bearing ill-will towards someone.”<sup>346</sup> Samuel Johnson called hatred “the passion contrary to love,” and associates it with ill-will, abhorrence, dislike and malevolence.<sup>347</sup> James Barclay defined hate as “an aversion in the mind to any thing or person who is considered as capable, or willing, to affect us with pain, together with the desire of procuring the pain or the unhappiness

---

<sup>342</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 1228–29.

<sup>343</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*.

<sup>344</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1792.

<sup>345</sup> Silvester Jenks, *Essay upon the Art of Love* ([London]: [s.n.], 1702), 17.

<sup>346</sup> Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*.

<sup>347</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 972–73.

of the person who is considered as having such an intention.”<sup>348</sup> Barclay retained the religious aspects in his definition of the verb, to hate, defining it as “to detest [something] on account of its being evil and repugnant to the law of morality, of our country, and of God.” He also gives several synonyms: to hate is aversion actuated by revenge; to abhor is aversion to “that for which we have a natural antipathy”; loathing he considers more applicable to food, than people; and to detest is to combine aversion with moral disapproval.

For 18<sup>th</sup>-century moralists, the key to managing both love and hatred in society lay in fixing them on the proper objects. “Love, like the rest of the human passions, is either a virtuous or vicious principle of action, as it is based on good or bad objects,” observed Timothy Greated in 1726.<sup>349</sup> In the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, moralists debated whether the love of creatures could ever be virtuous. Anglican divine John Norris, corresponding with Mary Astell in 1695, argued that Love could be virtuous only if directed at God.<sup>350</sup> Astell agreed but admitted to difficulty in forswearing the love of Creatures. Astell is “loath to abandon all Thoughts of Friendship,” and admits that she finds it “difficult to love at all, without something of desire.”<sup>351</sup> It was this associated desire which was the problem. “If we permit Desire,” she warns, “we can never be secure from irregular Love, that Shame and Misery of Mankind, it being easier not to desire at all than to

---

<sup>348</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1792.

<sup>349</sup> Timothy Greated, *Essay on Friendship; or, a Moral Discourse on the Nature and Effects of a Mutual Love* (London: Printed by J. Ilive, 1726), 1.

<sup>350</sup> Catherine Wilson, “Love of God and Love of Creatures: The Masham-Astell Exchange,” in *The Concept of Love in 17th and 18th Century Philosophy*, ed. Gabor Boros, Herman De Dijn, and Martin Moors (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2007), 127.

<sup>351</sup> Mary Astell and John Norris, *Letters Concerning the Love of God: Between the Author of The Proposal to the Ladies and Mr. John Norris: Wherein His Late Discourse, Shewing, That It Ought to Be Intire and Exclusive of All Other Loves, Is Further Cleared and Justified.*, The Third Edition (London: Printed for Edmund Parker, 1730), 32.

desire in Moderation. For Love is an insinuating Passion, and wherever 'tis permitted, will spread and make its Way.”<sup>352</sup>

Lady Damaris Masham objected to Astell and Norris' rejection of the Love of Creatures as sinful. Speaking of the Biblical injunction to “Love Thy Neighbour as Thyself”, Masham rejected the idea that love must include desire.<sup>353</sup> She argued that Love of Creatures changed in nature depending on its object,<sup>354</sup> and that people are capable of loving more than one thing at a time: love of creatures did not exclude the love of God “... any more than that the Love of Cherries should exclude our love of the Friend that gives them to us.”<sup>355</sup> In this, she echoes her teacher John Locke's view that “Love, to a Being capable of Happiness or Misery, is often the ... Delight, ... arising from a consideration of their very Being, or Happiness.”<sup>356</sup>

As the 18<sup>th</sup> century progressed, the idea that it was possible, and indeed admirable, to love both God and God's creatures, came to dominate. Many Christians began to struggle with the double-duty to both love the neighbour and hate sin. As the previous chapter has shown, Mandeville had pointed out the hypocrisy of many religious people, who criticized vice while living on the fruits of it. Increasingly, zealous Christians faced the accusation that, rather than loving their neighbour, they were instead consumed with hatred. In their attempt to answer this conundrum,

---

<sup>352</sup> Astell and Norris, 63.

<sup>353</sup> Damaris Masham, *A Discourse Concerning the Love of God* (London: Awnsham and John Churchil, 1696), 16.

<sup>354</sup> Masham, 10, 18.

<sup>355</sup> Masham, 88.

<sup>356</sup> John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* [1689], ed. Alexander Campbell Fraser (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), 304.

some began to argue that hating sin and bringing sinners to justice was an act of love to mankind.<sup>357</sup> The basis for this argument was two-fold: by ensuring sinners were punished, they saved others from following the dangerous path, and all of humanity from God's wrath. In 1702, an anonymous cleric made just such an argument regarding sodomy.<sup>358</sup>

In a 1724 sermon, Rev. Edward Chandler, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, told the assembled members of the London SRM that their cause was no less than the salvation of their fellow-creatures, the prosperity of the Nation, and the honor of God.<sup>359</sup> In 1742, Samuel Collett drew the logical conclusion: if to hate those who hate God is to love one's fellow-creatures, then to fail to deliver them to justice is to hate society. To protect a criminal was "to the Detriment of the whole, which sustains a greater Damage by such Partiality."<sup>360</sup>

In moral philosophy, too, both love and hate had powerful impacts on society. For another student of Locke's, the third Earl of Shaftesbury, the love of an individual led to the love of all nature, of virtue, and of God.<sup>361</sup> According to Paul Kelleher, Shaftesbury's conception of love encompassed a huge variety of emotional bonds: filial, parental, and conjugal affection and

---

<sup>357</sup> A similar strategy is used by modern White Nationalists. Cf. Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (New York: Routledge, 2014), Chap. 2.

<sup>358</sup> Minister of the Church of England, *The Sodomites Shame and Doom, Laid before Them with Great Grief and Compassion.*, 3. This argument will be discussed further in chapter 3.

<sup>359</sup> Edward Chandler, *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners at St. Mary-Le-Bow, on Monday, January the 4th, 1724.* (London: Printed for James Knapton, 1724), 24.

<sup>360</sup> Samuel Collet, *The Christian's Rule of Love, ... In a Discourse on the Duty of Love* (London: Printed for J. Noon, 1742), 9.

<sup>361</sup> Anthony Ashley Cooper Shaftesbury Third Earl of, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times [1711]*, ed. John M. Robertson, vol. 2 (London: Grant Richards, 1900), 20–26.

friendship, as well as aesthetic perception, intellectual passion, and moral judgement.<sup>362</sup> Francis Hutcheson defined love as “the Desire of the Happiness of another, generally attended with some Approbation of him.”<sup>363</sup> For Love, both moral approval and benevolence are essential.<sup>364</sup> For Hume, benevolence was an after-effect of love, not an essential part of its nature.<sup>365</sup> In his view, moral approval caused love, and love caused benevolence, though he later amended this, arguing that love could be caused by any human aspect which causes pleasure.<sup>366</sup>

Similarly, Hutcheson considered both moral disapproval and lack of benevolence as requirements of hatred.<sup>367</sup> Likewise, for Hume, vice in another person inspires hatred in the same way that virtue in a person inspires love.<sup>368</sup> The social danger of hatred was that it was easily spread. Like love, it extended even to “the friends and relations of him we love or hate.”<sup>369</sup> That hatred was unpleasant would become a truism. As Thomas Cogan observed, “the affection of Hatred is of so unpleasant a nature, that the Being who could hate everything, would be his own tormentor. The sole pleasure of which malevolence is capable, proceeds from the gratification of

---

<sup>362</sup> Paul Kelleher, *Making Love. Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*. (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2015), 41–42.

<sup>363</sup> Francis Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections*. (London; Dublin: Reprinted by S. Powell, 1728), 43.

<sup>364</sup> Elizabeth S. Radcliffe, “Love and Benevolence in Hutcheson’s and Hume’s Theories of the Passions,” *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 12, no. 4 (2004): 632.

<sup>365</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 367–68; Radcliffe, “Love and Benevolence in Hutcheson’s and Hume’s Theories of the Passions,” 641. An analysis of this can be found in Nancy Schaubert, “Hume on Moral Motivation: It’s Almost like Being in Love,” *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (1999): 341–66.

<sup>366</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 332, 367.

<sup>367</sup> Hutcheson, *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections*, 43.

<sup>368</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 337.

<sup>369</sup> Hume, 341.



revenge.”<sup>370</sup> While revenge was recognized as natural, real virtue lay in forgiveness. Love, when fixed on the proper objects, and channeled in the proper way, had the power to transform society into a truly moral world. Likewise, if hatred was not similarly fixed and channelled, threatened to rip society apart.

## Love, Hatred and Sodomy

The long 18<sup>th</sup> century saw huge changes in the public expression of friendship. Early modern friendships were explicitly physical: kisses, embraces, sharing a table, sleeping together, being buried together.<sup>371</sup> Over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century these physical intimacies became associated with sodomy. For the anonymous author of *Satan’s Harvest Home*, men kissing each other in greeting (which had been ubiquitous in the 17<sup>th</sup> century) was the first step on the slippery slope to Sodomy.<sup>372</sup> By the time Johann von Archenholz visited England in the late 1780s, men no longer kissed each other in greeting, but used the hand-shake.<sup>373</sup>

The reason for this change was the increase in the public expression of hatred towards sodomites. As Rev. John Bidlake observed in 1795, “the progress of hatred ... begins with a small disgust and ends in a settled aversion.”<sup>374</sup> The disgust at the very thought of sodomy seen in the previous chapter, conferred upon the body of the sodomite, was very easily transformed into virulent

---

<sup>370</sup> Cogan, *A Philosophical Treatise on the Passions*, 34.

<sup>371</sup> Bray, *The Friend*, Chap. 4.

<sup>372</sup> Anonymous, *Satan’s Harvest Home: Or the Present State of Whorecraft, Adultery, Fornication, Procuring, Pimping, Sodomy, and the Game of Flatts*. (London: Sold at the Change, St. Paul’s, Fleet Street, 1749), 51–52.

<sup>373</sup> Johann Wilhelm von Archenholz, *A Picture of England: Containing a Description of the Laws, Customs, and Manners of England. Interspersed with Curious and Interesting Anecdotes...* (Dublin: P. Byrne, 1791), 198.

<sup>374</sup> John Bidlake, *Sermons, on Various Subjects*, vol. 1 (London: Printed for T. Chapman, 1795), 11.

hatred; hatred supported by religion, public opinion, and the law. As will be seen in the subsections below, the feelings did not disappear, but a sharp dichotomy between love (which could be romantic but not sexual) and sex was erected to preserve the noble institution of friendship from the taint of sodomy. Over the course of the century, and into the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this would be transformed into the widespread institution of ‘romantic friendship.’

## Love and Hate among the Elite

When Richard Wise, manservant and secretary to Granville Piper, died in 1726, he left instructions (given to him by Piper at his death in 1717), that they be buried together, and that a cenotaph be erected in the Piper family tomb in St. Mary Magdalene Church in Launceton, Cornwall, as “monumentum mutui eorum Amoris.”<sup>375</sup> This caused quite a scandal. When the monument was finally constructed in 1731, it included a single funerary urn, the inscription of which immortalized their friendship.<sup>376</sup> Fifty years later, in December of 1781, William Beckford agonized over the suspicion of his relationship with the young Lord Courtenay. Comparing it to hell, he argued that there was no state more frightening, than being “... accused of the ruin of a being I adore in whom all human affections are concentrated to a point. Such ... are the Demons that Destiny has set on my trail.”<sup>377</sup> Three years later, when the pair were discovered in bed together, the ensuing scandal ruined both their lives. Beckford’s love for

---

<sup>375</sup> “A monument to their mutual love”. Translated and quoted in Bray, *The Friend*, 230.

<sup>376</sup> “And as in life they were one at heart and in kinship and friendship, so after death they were even then not divided most faithful pair of friends.” Quoted and translated in Bray, 211.

<sup>377</sup> William Beckford to Contessa d’Orsini-Rosenberg, December 1781. Quoted in Alexander, *England’s Wealthiest Son*, 263–66. Translated from French and cited in Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 145–46.

Courtenay was transformed into bitterness and hatred.<sup>378</sup> Education provided language for elites to express romantic and even erotic feelings for other men. If their wealth and influence allowed them to avoid the deadliest consequences of the public hatred of the sodomitical, reactions were nevertheless severe. This section will consider how elites navigated the treacherous rapids of love, power, hatred, and sodomy.

### ‘Be Thou Unto Me, as Mohammed to Ajesha’: Love and Sodomy in Elite Circles.

A few years after the construction of the Piper-Wise monument in Cornwall, the poet Thomas Gray told his friend Horace Walpole of his love for him. As in much of their early correspondence, Gray wrote in the character of Orozmales (the Zoroastrian god from Lee’s *The Rival Queens*), and, in the flowery language of the Koran, begged his Celadon (Walpole) to be his husband, to be “unto me, as Mohammed to Ajesha...”<sup>379</sup> In earlier letters, Gray described himself as Queen Proserpine to Walpole’s Pluto, Cleopatra to his Marc Antony.<sup>380</sup> According to literary scholar George Haggerty, the sentimental “man of feeling” attempted to “reimagine the emotional valence of male friendship and male rivalry and to reconceive male relations as loving.” He claims that “in the affection of the man of feeling, in his very sensibility,” it is possible to find a source of sexual identity that has less to do “with the libertine contempt for

---

<sup>378</sup> Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 198 n35. At least one biographer has followed Beckford and blamed the sixteen-year-old Courtenay for Beckford’s downfall: John Walter Oliver, *The Life of William Beckford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932), 196n. More recent scholars have been hesitant to blame a youth for the adult’s disgrace.

<sup>379</sup> Thomas Gray to Horace Walpole, 6 Dec. 1736. Printed in Paget Toynbee, ed., *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915), 17–19. Ajesha was Mohammed’s third wife.

<sup>380</sup> Thomas Gray to Horace Walpole, 8 Dec. 1734. Printed in Toynbee, 1:14.

sexual object choice than it does with affectionate desire between men.” While he acknowledges that this can be found in the molly houses, and in the parks and streets of 18th-century London, “an educated man of feeling was able ... with his class and gender privilege ... to articulate his desire in terms that configured male-male affection as romantic love.”<sup>381</sup>

### Love and Traditional Frameworks in Elite Sodomitical Relationships

Achieving this reconfiguration frequently required the use of traditional frameworks for male-male relationships; failing that, the use of gendered role-playing, like that of Walpole and Gray mentioned above, allowed for the expression of desire through the medium of a woman, even one who did not exist. Friendship itself provided a stable framework for this love, but one that was increasingly under stress. A few years before the letters above were written, Lord Hervey was involved in a relationship with Stephen Fox which Robert Halsband calls “sentimental sodomy.”<sup>382</sup> One letter suggests their relationship was in fact sexual,<sup>383</sup> and all the letters sent over the course of six years are undeniably love letters. Writing to Stephen at Bath, where he was to meet up with him, Hervey expressed his love for him in explicit terms: “I *must* see you soon. I can’t live without You; ... every thing that either does or ought to influence one’s thoughts or one’s actions makes mine center and depend on You. Adieu, le plus amiable & le plus aimé qu’il

---

<sup>381</sup> Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 158–59.

<sup>382</sup> Robert Halsband, *Lord Hervey: Eighteenth-Century Courtier* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 90. By this, Halsband means it was romantic and sensual, though not necessarily sexual.

<sup>383</sup> Lord Hervey to Stephen Fox, 1 June 1727. Printed in Hervey, *Lord Hervey and His Friends, 1726-38*, 16. This letter is discussed further in Chapter 3.

y est au monde.”<sup>384</sup> This friendship was clearly not based on court or political connections;

Stephen Fox was a Tory and voted against the Government of which Hervey was a part.

To those outside the relationship, the intense love emotions enjoined by elite friendships could easily read as sodomitical. In 1764, after Henry Seymour Conway was dismissed from Lord

Grenville’s ministry, Horace Walpole came to his cousin’s public and earnest defence.<sup>385</sup>

Replying to this, William Guthrie implied that this defence was due to the “unhappy situation of my Author [Walpole], *C’est une affaire du Coeur*: ‘Tis his first love who has been so

barbarously used.”<sup>386</sup> As George Haggerty points out, the use of the French phrase suggests the

sodomitical, while Walpole’s ‘unhappy situation’ refers to his gender; being a man, Walpole can

never hope to have his love returned or approved of by society.<sup>387</sup> Walpole sent his cousin a

copy of the scurrilous pamphlet, and used the opportunity to reassure Conway of his friendship:

They have nothing better to say, than that I am in love with you, and have been so these twenty years ... I am a very constant old swain: they might have made the years above thirty; it is so long I have had the same unalterable friendship for you, independent of being near relations and bred up together.<sup>388</sup>

---

<sup>384</sup> Lord Hervey to Stephen Fox, 15 Dec. 1729. Printed in Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 88. ‘Goodbye [to] the most lovable and the most beloved [man] in all the world’ (translation mine).

<sup>385</sup> Horace Walpole, *A Counter-Address to the Public, on the Late Dismission of a General Officer* (London: Printed for J. Almon., 1764).

<sup>386</sup> William Guthrie, *A Reply to the Counter-Address; Being a Vindication of a Pamphlet Entitled, An Address to the Public, on the Late Dismission of a General Officer* (London: Printed for W. Nicoll, 1764), 25.

<sup>387</sup> Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 155.

<sup>388</sup> Horace Walpole to Henry Conway, 1 Sept. 1764, in Horace Walpole, *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, Digital Collection, vol. 38 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1937), 437.

Walpole loved Conway as a friend and cousin, and the two shared a love occasionally tinged with the erotic.<sup>389</sup> George Haggerty describes their relationship as containing “a measure of intimacy that defies interpretation.”<sup>390</sup>

The key to preventing these romantic relationships from being read as sodomitical was two-fold. The first method was to enforce a distinction between love and sex, and the second, to use socially acceptable relationships to mask romantic affections. The former has been discussed in the previous chapter, as elite men pursued sexual relationships with men of lower ranks which they could most easily control. While these transactions occasionally used romantic language, their commercial and ephemeral nature made emotional connections difficult, if not impossible. The second technique drew on existing frameworks for affective love relationships between men.

Friendship was one such framework. Another useful frame was family, either biological or chosen. While Walpole insisted that his love for Conway is much greater than that of mere cousins, he still referenced that connection when telling Conway of his love, “which grew up with your virtues, which I admired though I did not imitate.”<sup>391</sup> Even when there was no actual familial bond, one could be created. Walpole’s correspondence with Horace Mann regularly

---

<sup>389</sup> In a letter to George Montagu, Walpole observes that ‘Nature always designed [Conway] for a hero of Romance.’ (2 July 1747); to Conway, 13 Sept. 1779, he assures him that he has seldom ‘been out of my thoughts. What *they* have been, you who know me so intimately may well guess, and why they do not pass my lips.’ Printed in Horace Walpole, *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, Digital Collection, vol. 9 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1937), 50; Horace Walpole, *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, Digital Collection, vol. 39 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1937), 339.

<sup>390</sup> Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 158–59.

<sup>391</sup> Horace Walpole to Henry Seymour Conway, 16 Sept. 1781. Printed in Walpole, *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, 1937, 39:384.

expresses intimacy in a paternal form (“My dearest child”). As George Haggerty observes, “Walpole and Mann created this familial bond in order to intensify their intimacy and put each other in a relationship even beyond that of immediate family.”<sup>392</sup> In an intriguing variation, both Walpole and Mann are variously the ‘father’ of the other, and this playful intimacy allows the sharing of deep emotional truths.

Patronage also provided another example: Richard Wise was Piper’s manservant and personal secretary; Thomas Gray, though educated at Eton and Cambridge, was the son of a scrivener and a milliner, while Walpole was the son of the Prime Minister, and his brother was a baronet. Mark Akenside was essentially kept by his patron/lover, Jeremiah Dyson; Dyson financed Akenside’s medical education in Scotland and the Netherlands, he subsidized Akenside’s medical practice, and bought a house in London where he and Akenside could live together as companions,<sup>393</sup> and he “remained emotionally loyal until he buried the 48-year-old Akenside in 1770.”<sup>394</sup> Lord Byron positioned himself as the ‘patron’ of his lover, Cambridge choirboy John Edlestone.<sup>395</sup>

As Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick powerfully argues, albeit for a different time and medium, the presence of a woman helps to render homoerotic relationships palatable in a homophobic

---

<sup>392</sup> Haggerty, *Horace Walpole’s Letters*, 4.

<sup>393</sup> Mrs. Dyson lived in a different house.

<sup>394</sup> George Rousseau, “‘In the House of Madam Vander Tasse, on the Long Bridge’: A Homosocial University Club in Early Modern Europe,” in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York: Harrington Park Press, 1990), 330. For a critical response to Rousseau, cf. Arthur H. Cash, “Wilkes, Baxter, and D’Holbach at Leiden and Utrecht: An Answer to G. S. Rousseau,” *The Age of Johnson* 7 (1996): 397–426.

<sup>395</sup> This relationship is discussed in Chapter 4.

society.<sup>396</sup> Elite sodomites used this technique, either with real women, or through role-playing.

In the correspondence of Gray and Walpole cited above, Gray cast himself, whether Ajesha, Prosperpine or Cleopatra, as a female character in a sexual relationship with the character played by Walpole. Hervey was aware of how easily the letters could be considered sodomitical: writing to Stephen in September 1729, he observed that, if someone examined his letters, “they would certainly conclude they came rather from a Mistress than a Friend.” Rather than being frightened by such a possibility, Hervey acknowledged Fox was his ‘Madness’ and assuring him “...que je vous aime, que je vous adore: & si vous m’aimé le même venez me le dire.”<sup>397</sup>

Despite the insistence of satirists and moralists that sodomites hated women, many elite sodomites had strong friendships with the women in their lives. As men of wealth and rank, they were expected to marry, and many did so. Lord Hervey even went as far as to arrange the marriage of Stephen Fox to the child-heiress Miss Horner in 1736 (this was only a formal bond until 1739, when Miss Horner came of age).<sup>398</sup> Some elite women seemed willing to support even this aspect of the men in their lives – Lady Hervey wrote to Stephen Fox, and knowing he would see her husband more frequently than she, asked him to scold her husband for her and tell her whether Hervey would come home to her and the children that summer. As Robert Halsband observes, it was “fortunate for Hervey that his wife should share, instead of resent, his fondness

---

<sup>396</sup> Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

<sup>397</sup> Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 102–3. ‘... that I love you, that I adore you, and if you love me the same, come tell me’ (translation mine).

<sup>398</sup> Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House*, 154.



for Stephen!”<sup>399</sup> Hervey’s long friendship with Lady Mary Wortley Montagu cooled somewhat in the late 1730s, when they both fell in love with Francesco Algarotti, an Italian Opera-singer.<sup>400</sup> William Beckford was married, and his wife supported him until her death in 1786 after giving birth to their daughter Susan. In later letters, he referred to his daughters as the “Pledges”, short for “pledges of love.”<sup>401</sup> Before his marriage, and after his wife’s death, he was frequently able to confide his feelings for male youths to elite female friends, such as Lady Catherine Hamilton, Contessa d’Orsini-Rosenberg, Louisa Beckford, and Charlotte Courtenay.

### ‘What is Worth Living for, if a Man Bears the Odium of Mankind?’: Hatred and Sodomy in Elite Circles.

After sentencing butcher Thomas Hickman to transportation for life in the 1824 Summer Assizes at Leicester for extorting money under threat of accusing the prosecutor of soliciting an unnatural crime, Lord Chief Justice Best explained why the sentence was so harsh: Hickman had been guilty of “the most grievous crime one man could commit against another.” The crime was so grievous because the consequences to the victim were nothing less than social death.<sup>402</sup> Elite men frequently found themselves in awkward places when dealing with sodomy. Their religious and moral education placed sodomy as a most grievous sin, and they had the responsibility of enforcing the law and protecting the civil and moral authority of their station. On the other hand,

---

<sup>399</sup> Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 120.

<sup>400</sup> This love-triangle is described in detail in Halsband, 198–203; Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House*, 154–58.

<sup>401</sup> Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 12, 53. Beckford also uses the same nickname when referring to the daughter of his best friend/agent Gregorio Franchi.

<sup>402</sup> *Saunders’ Newsletter*, 19 Aug. 1824. Hickman was later pardoned, after the Court of King’s Bench determined that solicitations to sodomy did not constitute an unnatural crime, and so Hickman’s threat did not fall within the statute. Cf. *Rex v. Thomas Hickman* (1824), 1 Mood 35–38; HO 13/43/303, TNA.

as will be seen in chapter 5, blackmail and extortion by threatening to swear sodomy had grown along with the increasing prosecution of sodomitical crimes, and elite men were aware of the danger to their lives and character.

Wealth and power helped considerably to shield elite sodomites from public hatred. Wealthy men accused of sodomy had several weapons in their arsenal. Offers of money or patronage could stop accusers from lower social groups from taking the case to court; if charges were pursued, the elite sodomite often had the resources to post bail and flee the country. If the case even came to trial, they were more likely to be acquitted, since they had greater social credit than their accusers. Often, they were able to counter-accuse the prosecutor with having robbed them; the prosecutor of a charge of sodomy could easily find himself in jail for highway robbery or extortion. The success of all these strategies depended on a sexual relationship with someone of a much lower rank.

### “The First Duty was Silence”: Law Enforcement, Public Hatred and Elite Sodomites

Local magistrates were often placed in a difficult situation when elite men were accused of sodomitical acts. As Louis Crompton argues, moral campaigns and the enforcement of law were key aspects of how Britain’s ruling elite remodeled and reshaped themselves during the long 18<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>403</sup> a remodeling accomplished “via the reformation of manners and an accompanying

---

<sup>403</sup> Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*; Crompton, *Homosexuality and Civilization*. On the remaking of the aristocracy after 1790, cf. Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*.

ethos of public and national service.”<sup>404</sup> In 1796, Captain Charles Sawyer of the H.M.S. *Blanche* was placed under arrest by his officers because of numerous complaints made against him by members of his crew. Horatio Nelson explained to Admiral Jervis as to why he had not placed Sawyer under arrest: he had not personally received any official complaints. He further expressed his hope that Sawyer would “take himself off” rather than force the Admiralty to proceed with his Court Martial for sodomitical acts.<sup>405</sup> Sawyer was convicted of uncleanness by the court; he was dismissed and barred from ever serving his Majesty in any capacity again.<sup>406</sup>

As Harry Cocks observes, local justices were under great stress to both enforce the law and to adhere to ties of class and locality. At Warrington, magistrates John Borron and Richard Gwilym were connected to most of the landed elites in both Cheshire and Lancashire and were clearly torn between their duties and their social, economic, and political ties. After more than thirty arrests of men of the middling and labouring sorts, the magistrates were given the names of several men of rank and character, including two M.Ps, a previous Whig parliamentary candidate, two Rectors (one a brother to an M.P., and the other brother-in-law to the thirteenth Earl of Derby), and a former Sheriff.<sup>407</sup> Borron and Gwilym referred the situation to Earl Spencer and Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough, who had encouraged the magistrates to investigate. After careful consideration (and outraged visits from several peers, whose clients

---

<sup>404</sup> Cocks, “Safeguarding Civility,” 122.

<sup>405</sup> Horatio Nelson to Admiral Sir John Jervis, K.B., Bastia, 14 Oct. 1796, in Horatio Nelson Nelson, *The Dispatches and Letters of Vice Admiral Lord Viscount Nelson*, ed. Nicholas Harris Nicolas, 2nd edition, vol. 7 (London: H. Colburn, 1845), Addenda cxxii. It is unclear whether he hoped Sawyer would desert or commit suicide.

<sup>406</sup> ADM 12/26 (Summary of the C.M. of Charles Sawyer, 18 Oct. 1796), TNA.

<sup>407</sup> Cocks, “Safeguarding Civility,” 137–38.

were among those implicated), they decided to shut down the investigation.<sup>408</sup> No man of rank or fortune was prosecuted. Shortly afterwards, Lord Sefton, the patron of M.P. John Birch, complained to Chief Justice Ellenborough that Gwilym had continued investigating Birch even after being ordered to cease. In his own defence, Gwilym insisted that he was not acting as a Magistrate but had assumed “the individual character of the friend anxious for the vindication of calumniated members of the same society.”<sup>409</sup> In investigating elite men, Borron and Gwilym had broken the unspoken rule: when faced with rumours of elite involvement in sodomitical activities, the “first duty was silence”, as the trial Judge, Mr. Baron Graham, informed Gwilym. Nor should the magistrate investigate the matter himself, but “wait for any event that might bring this painful story officially before him.”<sup>410</sup> When surgeon James Taylor was executed in 1810 on board the H.M.S. *Puissant*, the Chaplain refused a list of names of “men whom the public look up to,” as “it could be of no service.”<sup>411</sup>

Another method of preventing elite men from being charged with sodomy was to warn them in advance of any charges against them. Such was the case for Lord Courtenay, Beckford’s erstwhile lover. In May 1811, he was informed that Mr. Morton, an Exeter Magistrate, had conclusive proof of his sodomitical behaviour. According to Joseph Farington, “when he was informed that the Officers of Justice were ordered to pursue him, he lost all resolution, wept like

---

<sup>408</sup>Cocks, 139. Borron informed Earl Spencer of the names of the elite men who frequented Hitchens’s house on 20 Sept. 1806; on 23 Sept. 1806, the decision was made to shut down the investigation.

<sup>409</sup> Richard Gwilym to Earl Spencer, 21 Jan. 1807; *Althorp Papers*, vol. dc.

<sup>410</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>411</sup> *Northampton Mercury*, 6 Jan. 1810.

a child and was willingly taken on board a vessel, the first that could be found, an American ship, and passed there under a feigned name.”<sup>412</sup> He lived out the remainder of his life in relative obscurity, first in New York and then in France, dying in Paris in 1835.<sup>413</sup>

## A Social Death: Social Ostracism, Hatred and Sodomy

While wealth and influence could protect elite men from much of the risk of prosecution for sodomitical acts, it could not completely protect them from hatred. Among their social equals, this often consisted of social death; for William Beckford, the public exposure of his affair with Lord Courtenay caused him to lose a patent for the peerage (which only lacked the King’s signature),<sup>414</sup> and banishment from court, though he was able to hold on to his seat in the House of Commons.<sup>415</sup> Even before he was forced to flee, Lord Courtenay’s sexual tastes were well known. As a result, “many of the neighbouring gentlemen refused to hold intercourse with him,” though his wealth and family connections ensured that “several respectable families” continued to visit.<sup>416</sup> Beckford was forbidden from visiting his daughters, for fear of ruining their chances of an advantageous marriage through their association with him; they did not visit him at Fonthill

---

<sup>412</sup> Joseph Farington, *The Farington Diary*, ed. James Grieg, vol. 6: Jan. 1810-June 1811 (London: Hutchinson, 1926), 273.

<sup>413</sup> H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name: A Candid History of Homosexuality in Britain*, 1st American ed (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970), 74–75.

<sup>414</sup> Hyde, 72–73.

<sup>415</sup> Beckford controlled the rotten borough of Hindon. He seldom attended Parliament himself, and later in his life sold his seat to his bankers in exchange for forgiveness of debts. Cf. Alexander, *England’s Wealthiest Son*.

<sup>416</sup> Farington, *The Farington Diary*, 6: Jan. 1810-June 1811:147–48.

until after their marriages. Even then, he was not allowed to visit his daughter Susan at Hamilton Palace, though his agent, Gregorio Franchi, was able to do so.<sup>417</sup>

This social death extended to other ranks of society, though in different ways. The middling sorts tended to express their disapproval of elite sodomy through condemnation in newspapers (usually without names attached), through satire, rumours, and moral outrage. They also expressed disapproval by proxy: Lord Courtenay was forced to abandon building a house in Cornwall because his servants were so badly treated, and the local tradesmen refused to do any business with them.<sup>418</sup> Other expressions of hatred could be found in extrajudicial justice, such as burning or hanging the elite sodomite in effigy. Should the unlucky sodomite attract attention, there was the ever-present risk of physical violence. As the Rev. Thomas Jephson's attorney observed, men known for sodomy always had to fear the mob. Should he be pointed out going through Barnwell, he asked rhetorically, there was no doubt that "a crowd would pursue him ... If there was a pond near the place, would he not have been ducked in it?" The attorney went on to lay that violence at the feet of 'the ladies', and that such violence was justified as "nature had implanted that feeling [hatred] in them."<sup>419</sup>

## Love, Hate and Sodomy: The Middling Sorts

The rapid expansion of Britain's mercantile and technological power, with the wealth and social capital it generated, led to the emergence by the late 18<sup>th</sup> century of culturally distinct "middle

---

<sup>417</sup> Alexander, *England's Wealthiest Son*, 186–87.

<sup>418</sup> Farington, *The Farington Diary*, 6: Jan. 1810-June 1811:148.

<sup>419</sup> *The Times*, 25 July 1823.

ranks,” who began to articulate their desire for a place at the political table. They based this argument on their virtue, which they considered to be different, and superior, to that of either the traditional elites (who held all political power) and the poor (who had none). This self-conception of virtue was expressed even before demands for political representation, through membership in civic societies and local politics, and expressions of religiosity and domesticity. Love was rooted in marriage to a virtuous woman, which inspired love for all nature and mankind.

Hatred of sin was one of the methods in which the middling sorts expressed that virtue. As the chief example of sin, hatred of sodomy had an important ideological role: opposition to sodomy not only showed moral superiority to both elites and the poor, who seemed (in the opinions of the middling sorts) entirely too willing to tolerate it, but demonstrated commitment to domesticity and marriage (which sodomites were seen to oppose). It was the middling sorts who made up most of the membership of the SRMs, and later the Society for the Prevention of Vice. Men of the middling sorts were most likely to bring sodomites to trial and wrote much of the anti-sodomitical material.

As a result of this, expressions of hatred against sodomy were often the most severe among the middling sorts. Sodomites of the middling sorts were more like to subsume the experience of love into different love-relationships: family, friendship, and faith. For some, love of other men became tied up in evangelism and the intense emotionality of religion.

## “They Accosted Each Other with the Title of Brother”: Love, Sodomy, and the Middling Sorts.

While the early 18<sup>th</sup>-century molly houses are heavily associated with the urban, criminal underworld, descriptions of sodomitical groups after mid-century are clearly modelled on the respectable clubs and societies which dominated the social life of men of the middling sort. In the furor over the pardon of Lt. Jones in 1772, newspapers referred to the joy of “Mr. Drybutter’s Club,”<sup>420</sup> the “Macaroni Club” and the “Club of Catamites and Macaronis” at the pardoning of “brother Jones,” and list activities such as toasting Jones’s and the King’s health, and proposing legislation to arrest pregnant women, outlaw mockery and criticism of sodomy, and to offer rewards to men to “join” the sodomites’ “profession.” Another presents them as a Turkish club, with “Mustapha Drybutter” being presented to the Caliph [George III], who issued a proclamation that sodomy was to be countenanced.<sup>421</sup> Another commentator in that same paper, addressing himself to the women, denied that a sodomite, such as Jones, was even capable of love.<sup>422</sup> As Steve Poole has found in Bristol, and Harry Cocks in Warrington, the danger of sodomy lay in its ability to hide in the heart of respectable society. They met in clubs, were part of broader neighbourhoods and communities, and often devout members of churches. When these men were discovered, accounts of sodomy among the middling sort show how it was embedded into the everyday routines and emotional communities.

---

<sup>420</sup> As a notorious sodomite, Drybutter’s name was frequently used as a shorthand for sodomite throughout the 1770s.

<sup>421</sup> *Middlesex Chronicle*, 7 Aug. 1772; *Morning Chronicle*, 21 Aug. 1772; *Morning Chronicle*, 25 Aug. 1772.

<sup>422</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 25 Aug. 1772.



An example of this can be found in the house of Isaac Hitchen, in Warrington, Lancashire (now in Cheshire). As the news broke of the discovery of a large community of sodomites in Warrington, newspapers reported that Hitchen had disguised his house, where the sodomites had met for years, as a Masonic lodge. There, a large group of men of all ages, ranks and stations met twice a week, and call each other ‘brother.’<sup>423</sup> This discovery caused a major social upheaval in Lancashire; in addition to the discovery of the involvement of elite men, most of the key members were respectable, even opulent, tradesmen and merchants; ones with social and business links not only within Warrington, but in Great Sankey, Liverpool, Manchester, and Chester.<sup>424</sup> Their appropriation of the forms of respectable homosocial groups challenged the foundations of middling society.

### Family, Respectability, and Sodomy

Accused sodomites also were part of broader family and social networks, who could be called on to vouch for their respectability (and thus probable innocence) in court. Family members also interceded to question the grounds of any rumours or charges before they got as far as a trial. When school-teacher Isaac Broderick was tried in 1730 for attempting sodomy with several students, his sister went immediately to the mother of one of the boys, demanding the grounds for the accusation.<sup>425</sup> Bridget, wife of George Thickbottom gave Henry Palmer money to keep him from accusing her husband of sodomy, and eventually the couple together had Palmer

---

<sup>423</sup> *Lancaster Gazette*, 30 August 1806.

<sup>424</sup> Cocks, “Safeguarding Civility,” 126–27.

<sup>425</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, May 1730, trial of Isaac Broderick (t17300513-27). Regarding his sister’s testimony, cf. Isaac Broderick, *An Appeal to the Public: Or, the Case of Mr Isaac Broderick, Late of Trinity College Cambridge, Fairly and Impartially Stated*. (London: Printed for the author, 1731), 35.

committed to New Prison.<sup>426</sup> The support of family was important to supporting the innocence of the accused, since it was assumed that family would not assist, love, or grieve someone guilty of sodomy. When David Thomas Myers was hanged at Peterborough in 1812, the anonymous author of the broadside account of his execution observed that he left “a family ... not to lament his loss, but to deplore the crimes of their father which in the sight of the world and of God is of the most heinous nature.”<sup>427</sup> Even when guilt had been very clearly established, sodomites, like most condemned criminals, drew upon broader social and emotional networks to appeal for mercy. William Cruchley, a midshipman tried for sodomy on board the HMS *Africaine* in 1816, appealed to the many connections and good character of his family; particularly his half-brother, a decorated army officer, and his father, who had served with Admiral Rodney (his prosecutor’s father) on board the *Anson*. Later, he attempted to create sympathy by appealing to the shame and disgrace that would be felt by his parents, brothers, and, especially, his sisters.<sup>428</sup>

---

<sup>426</sup> *Daily Courant*, 13 Aug. 1731.

<sup>427</sup> Myers, *The Last Dying Words, Behaviour, and Confession of D.T. Myers, Who Was Executed at Peterborough, on Monday the 4th, of May, for an Unnatural Crime*.

<sup>428</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Court Martial of William Cruchley and George Parsons, 16-19 Jan. 1816), TNA. After Cruchley’s conviction, his parents and two unmarried sisters left England forever. His father and sister Eliza died in Switzerland; his mother and sister Julia lived out the rest of their life in Jersey. It is unclear whether Cruchley joined them after his release from prison, or simply changed his name and disappeared. Cf. Andrew Kerr-Jarrett, “Frances Newton JARRETT” and “William Lockhart Jarrett CRUCHLEY” at [www.orange-tree-valley-co.uk/hnj/rr01/rr01\\_003.htm#P44](http://www.orange-tree-valley-co.uk/hnj/rr01/rr01_003.htm#P44) and [www.orange-tree-valley-co.uk/hnj/rr01/rr01\\_010.htm#P204](http://www.orange-tree-valley-co.uk/hnj/rr01/rr01_010.htm#P204). Much of the information included is based on data compiled in 1900 by William James Kerr, with additional genealogical research compiled by the author’s father and cousin.

## “...his Heart Full of Love ... his Eyes Full of Heaven”: Love, Faith, and Sodomy

Sodomites were also embedded within communities of faith. George Duffus was a ‘zealous Presbyterian,’<sup>429</sup> who attended church regularly, and was credited to be extremely religious. At his trial, Nicholas Leader reported that he had met Duffus at the Old Gravel Lane Meeting House, where Duffus spoke to him about the sermon and complimented the Minister. He did so three or four Sundays in succession, and impressed Leader with his religiosity. According to Mr. Powel, Duffus did not drink alcohol on Sundays, and was fond of religious discussion.<sup>430</sup> Both Leader and Powel, as well as the writer of the *Weekly Journal* considered this faith to be false, given Duffus’ seduction attempts; a ‘mask of fanatick zeal.’ Given the availability of both molly houses and male prostitutes in London, however, it seems unlikely that Duffus would go to the trouble of regular church attendance and sober living solely to find sexual partners.

For some men who were romantically attracted to other men, the intense homosocial bonds of evangelical religion held immense appeal. Like the romantic friendships fostered in elite boarding schools, evangelical religion encouraged open discussion of feelings, particularly love. Henry Abelow argues that early Methodists found sanction in Wesley’s message of love “for releasing same-sex sexual feeling.”<sup>431</sup> Wesley demonstrated sympathy with convicted sodomites

---

<sup>429</sup> *Weekly Journal (Saturday’s Post)*, 23 Dec. 1721.

<sup>430</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, December 1721, trial of George Duffus (t17211206-20).

<sup>431</sup> Henry Abelow, *The Evangelist of Desire: John Wesley and the Methodists* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990), 63.

early in his career,<sup>432</sup> visiting Blair, a man “who was found guilty of Sodomitical Practices and fined 20 marks by the recorder,” in an Oxford jail in Nov. 1732.<sup>433</sup>

Susan Gane draws on the serialised autobiography of British soldier Sampson Staniforth, published between January and July 1783 in John Wesley’s *Arminian Magazine*.<sup>434</sup> Staniforth was converted in Flanders in 1743, by private Mark Bond. Bond himself had only recently been converted by the army revivalist preachers in Flanders; and was determined to save Staniforth. “He could not rest, either day or night, but it was on his mind ‘Go to Sampson’.”<sup>435</sup> After several attempts, Staniforth, having spent all his money on alcohol and gambling, agreed to go to hear a preacher if Bond would give him meat and drink. Following Staniforth’s conversion experience, Bond took him “to be with him as his comrade, and watched over me, as a tender parent over a beloved child.”<sup>436</sup> Finding that Staniforth was deeply in debt, Bond suggested that they combine their pay, and live frugally, until the debt was paid. Over the next two years, their friendship became more and more emotionally intense. One evening, overcome with a sense of guilt, Staniforth confessed to Bond that he had committed the “unpardonable sin”; Bond sympathized with him, and assured him of his deliverance.<sup>437</sup> Before the battle of Fontenay in May 1745, they

---

<sup>432</sup> Abelove, 66.

<sup>433</sup> Thomas Wilson, Diary Entry for 22 Nov. 1732. Printed in Thomas Wilson, *The Diaries of Thomas Wilson, D.D., 1731-37 and 1750: Son of Bishop Wilson of Sodor & Man*, ed. Charles Lawrence Scruton Linell (London: S.P.C.K., 1964).

<sup>434</sup> Gane, “Common Soldiers, Same-Sex Love and Religion in the Early Eighteenth-Century British Army,” 638.

<sup>435</sup> Sampson Staniforth, “An Account of Mr. S. Staniforth, pt. 2” *Arminian Magazine* 6 (Feb. 1783): 68.

<sup>436</sup> Staniforth, 70. Given that Staniforth was older than Bond, this is an interesting metaphor for their relationship.

<sup>437</sup> Staniforth, 71-2.

“had sweet communion together.”<sup>438</sup> Later, Staniforth become engaged to a woman in Deptford, on the condition that he leave the army. Bond agreed Staniforth should get out of the army, but “prayed that he might not live to see it.”<sup>439</sup> Bond got his wish, dying of two musket-balls to the leg at Maastricht. When he was first hit, Bond “fell down at my feet, looked up in my face with a smile and said, ‘My dear, I am wounded.’”<sup>440</sup> Staniforth carried him off the battlefield. Bond would later die in his arms, “his heart ... full of love, and his eyes full of heaven.” Staniforth reflected that there were “none so full of [love] as my dear companion.”

Later in life, Wesley wrote to a member of the Methodist Society that, “[w]icked persons are ... incapable of friendship. For ‘he who fears no God, can love no friend.’ ... I apprehend that wicked men, under whatever dispensation, to be absolutely incapable of true friendship.”<sup>441</sup>

Despite the clear elements of same-sex love in Staniforth’s story, Wesley selected and chose to publish it in his magazine; “possibly showing that salvation was open to everyone who led a good Christian life.”<sup>442</sup> As will be seen below, antinomian preachers such as John Church would find great popularity among the urban poor by preaching that, once saved, the faithful were incapable of sin.

---

<sup>438</sup> Sampson Staniforth, “An Account of Mr. S. Staniforth (pt. 3)” in *Arminian Magazine* 6 (March 1783): 124.

<sup>439</sup> Sampson Staniforth, “An Account of Mr. S. Staniforth (pt. 5)” in *Arminian Magazine* 6 (May 1783): 238.

<sup>440</sup> Staniforth, 242.

<sup>441</sup> John Wesley, *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*, Third Edition, vol. 7 (London: Published by John Mason, 1830), 279.

<sup>442</sup> Gane, “Common Soldiers, Same-Sex Love and Religion in the Early Eighteenth-Century British Army,” 647–48. As Gane points out, later Methodists would become uncomfortable with this aspect of the story and would carefully edit out the more romantic aspects of the story.

## “I am the Detestation of all Mankind”: Hatred and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts.

On 11 Oct. 1771, the new city officers for Westminster were sworn in before Sir John Fielding. Among those selected was Samuel Drybutter, who found himself presented for the office of Petty Constable of St. Margaret's. As the writer of *Bingley's Journal* observed, Drybutter was in the humiliating position of explaining why he was unsuitable. He told them,

Sir, I think I am not eligible; but supposing I was, I am a very improper man; you know I am the detestation of all mankind; every man who hears me, hates, detests, and abhors me; I am presented to the office partly out of joke, and partly from malice; they who have presented me know what I am, and you, all of you know, that I am not a fit person to be put into this office... The world calls me a S-----e, I am one.<sup>443</sup>

The Court of Burgesses, though shocked and horrified, felt that this should not excuse him from “serving an office of trouble and expence,” and selected him anyway. He was duly sworn in, though Sir John publicly lamented that the Court of Burgesses had disgraced the office by “putting such an unnatural monster among them.” Drybutter personally felt the consequences of being “the detestation of all mankind”; while his wealth allowed him to ‘make-up’ any charges with poor men and boys prior to trial, he experienced serious physical harm from ‘the mob’. In 1777, he attempted to ‘pick up’ a soldier in St. James’ Park; the soldier turned him over to the mob; he was dunked and severely beaten: the mob broke his arm and gave him serious internal

---

<sup>443</sup> *Bingley's Journal*, 12 Oct. 1771.

injuries; his house in Pall Mall had all its windows broken, and barely survived being torn down.<sup>444</sup> The newspapers reported a few days later that he had died of his injuries.<sup>445</sup>

## Not Respectable: The Costs of Being a Known Sodomite

While some sodomites, like Drybutter, were wealthy enough to be (relatively) open about their sexuality, this came at a very high cost. Just as with elite men, sodomites of the middling sorts were subject to a range of aggressive behaviour, beginning with social isolation, and the risk of disgrace and ruin if discovered. As has been seen above, men and women of the middling sorts prided themselves on their virtue, moral fiber, and respectability. As the enforcers of the laws, the writers of the newspapers, and determiners of ‘respectability’, the middling sorts held incredible power to shape public opinion. George L. Mosse argues that in the 19<sup>th</sup> century the forces of nationalism and bourgeois respectability combined to shape attitudes toward sex.<sup>446</sup> Evangelical religion and romanticism together created the idea of a ‘proper’ and ‘decent’ sexuality, which was ‘normal’ and ‘natural’. According to Mosse, when these attitudes combined with nationalism, patriotism was equated with sexual normality; ‘unnatural’ sex with national decline and racial corruption. As has been seen in the previous chapter, this process was already

---

<sup>444</sup> The actions of the mob and the property damage are chronicled in the *Daily Advertiser* for 2 July 1777; that of 4 July describes the extent and serious state of his injuries.

<sup>445</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 8 July 1777. Word of his death was premature – the *Modern London Spy* of 1781 speaks of him as if he was still alive (p. 84), and his Will was proved in London on 8 May 1793, possibly as many as six years after he died in Paris. PROB 11/1232/67, TNA. Cf. Rictor Norton, “The Macaroni Club: Homosexual Scandals in 1772,” *Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England: A Sourcebook* (blog), December 19, 2004, <http://rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/macaroni.htm>. and John Culme, “Trade in Fancy: New Findings from Eighteenth Century London,” *Silver Society Journal* 12 (2000): 98–110.

<sup>446</sup> George L. Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988).

beginning by the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Sodomy was constructed as being a foreign, dangerous import; and its tolerance a threat to the nation.

The unwillingness to associate in anyway with those suspected of sodomy extended to other aspects of respectable life. The cost of being accused of sodomitical practices, even if they were disproved in court, could destroy a man's reputation. In 1793, a man named Gillum was kicked out of a Lottery Club after a rumour resurfaced that he had been accused of sodomy – later, after it was revealed that a man had spread rumours about him a few years earlier to extort money, he was allowed to return to the club.<sup>447</sup> A clergyman named Sanders found himself losing out on a position at Stamford, when his competitor, a fellow Anglican divine, spread rumours that he had had to leave a parish in Manchester for sodomitical practices.<sup>448</sup> John Silver, a surgeon and married father of nine children, was denied membership to the Musical Club and the Catch Club after Francis Cobb spread rumours that he was a sodomite and addicted to sodomitical practices. Silver successfully sued Cobb for the damage to his reputation and received £50 in damages.<sup>449</sup>

In 1826, in the area surrounding Lincoln, a group of sodomites came to the attention of the magistrates, who made several arrests. The arrest (and subsequent flight) of a man named Dr. Eyre caused wide ripples in the wider community: two neighbours in Dunholme, one, Mr. Balfour, a prosperous farmer, and the other, Mr. Twyford, a retired Navy man, found their friendship torn apart by rumour and slander. Both men were Scottish, and, prior to the discovery

---

<sup>447</sup> *Evening Mail*, 24-26 June 1793.

<sup>448</sup> *Stamford Mercury*, 24 March 1809. The Lincolnshire Jury awarded Sanders £200 damages.

<sup>449</sup> *Kentish Gazette* 19 March 1813; *Kentish Weekly Post (Canterbury Journal)* 23 March 1813.



of the sodomites, had been on very intimate terms. Mr. Balfour, however, was known to be a friend of Dr. Eyre's, and had attended dances at his house on numerous occasions: Mr. Twyford, in order to protect his own reputation, not only promptly ended his friendship with Mr. Balfour, but made it clear to several people his reasons for so doing. In the following suit for defamation of character, the court found that Mr. Twyford had indeed defamed Mr. Balfour – but awarded him only £20 damages, with 40s. costs, rather than the £1500 Mr. Balfour had requested. According to the *Nottingham Journal*, Mr. Balfour's friendship with Dr. Eyre was enough foundation for Mr. Twyford to assume Mr. Balfour was a sodomite as well.<sup>450</sup>

It was among the middling sorts that the most extreme expressions of hatred against sodomy and sodomites were observed. These were often justified by appeals to religion, or to the 'natural' love of women, who were somehow being harmed by its existence. Jeremy Bentham, however, was highly critical of this reasoning, since

... a man who should be known to be indifferent, or even averse to women would not be the object of any such abhorrence, at least of any abhorrence near equal to it, if he were exempt from any suspicion of this crime: on the other hand, a man supposed to be guilty of it, though he were known to have a connection with never so many women would not find the detestation of him anything if at all abated by it.<sup>451</sup>

For Bentham, the hatred of sodomy was rooted in the disgust that most people felt toward the practice. He observed that "in persons of weak minds, anything which is unusual and at the same time physically disgusting is apt to excite the passion of hate. Hatred when once excited naturally

---

<sup>450</sup> *Nottingham Journal*, 22 July 1826 (clipping in HO 17/97, TNA).

<sup>451</sup> Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 65.

seeks its gratification in the tormenting or destruction of the object that excited it.”<sup>452</sup> Writing the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, Rev. John Bidlake (1755-1814), then Headmaster of Plymouth Grammar School, observed that hatred “... begins with a small disgust, and ends in a settled aversion.”<sup>453</sup>

## Disgust, Self-Loathing, Hatred and Sodomy

As I will show in Chapter 5, sodomites (real or suspected) were often pelted with disgusting things and ducked under pumps, or in streams, lakes, or rivers as a method of instilling shame. This sudden violence, and the extreme nature of the reaction, is also an expression of hatred, and fits the traditional definition of a pogrom. In 1730, a man of Bristol caught committing sodomy with two others (who escaped) was badly beaten before being taken to prison.<sup>454</sup> The hatred of the mob for sodomites was well known and could be harnessed. When a young man was accosted by an older sodomite in a London field cried out Murder!, the mob was barely restrained from ripping him to pieces.<sup>455</sup> Philip Davis, a Dutch man who had been living in London for only fifteen months, used the threat of the mob to extort money from Edward Peterson. At his trial, the Judge observed that his threat to tell the mob that Peterson was a

---

<sup>452</sup> Jeremy Bentham, “Jeremy Bentham’s Essay on ‘Pederasty’: Part II,” ed. Louis Crompton, *Journal of Homosexuality* 4, no. 1 (1978): 106.

<sup>453</sup> Bidlake, *Sermons, on Various Subjects*, 1:11.

<sup>454</sup> *London Evening Post*, 18-20 Aug. 1730; *Daily Journal*, 19 Aug. 1730; *Read's Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 22 Aug. 1730; *Universal Spectator (Weekly Journal)*, 22 Aug. 1730.

<sup>455</sup> *Norwich Gazette*, 27 June – 4 July 1741; *London Daily Post*, 30 June 1741.

sodomite made his crime far more serious than the robbery alone.<sup>456</sup> Davis was hanged on 26 Dec. 1792.<sup>457</sup>

For sodomites of the middling sorts, the prevalent responses of virulent hatred and social ostracism were difficult to reject, even for those determined to do so. Even James Taylor, the surgeon of the H.M.S. *Jamaica*, who was a “man of good education, strong natural abilities, and very extensive reading” particularly Voltaire, Bolingbroke, “and other infidel authors”,<sup>458</sup> was overwhelmed by them. Prior to his execution at Portsmouth on the 26 Dec. 1809, he confessed to the Rev. Mr. Howell that he had long participated in “the hateful crime,” and “now loathed himself... and cried unto God for a pardon of all sins.” In Peterborough, David Myers likewise confessed his guilt, and desired that his shameful, untimely death might serve as a warning to others guilty of the same crime.<sup>459</sup>

## Love, Hatred and Sodomy: The Poor.

While newspaper and popular accounts emphasized the violent hatred of the poor, particularly poor women, for sodomites, this response is not completely borne out by the historical record. As was the case with disgust, trial testimonies reveal a surprising indifference to sodomy; even when the sodomite is disliked and hated, it is hardly ever to such a degree to be worth the trouble

---

<sup>456</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, October 1792, trial of PHILLIP DAVIS (t17921031-33); the judge’s comments to the Jury are given in the *Evening Mail*, 5-7 Nov. 1792.

<sup>457</sup> Home Office, Criminal Registers of Prisoners in Middlesex and the City. September 1792- September 1793. *London Lives*, NAHOCR700060016-7.

<sup>458</sup> *Northampton Mercury*, 6 Jan. 1810.

<sup>459</sup> Myers, *The Last Dying Words, Behaviour, and Confession of D.T. Myers, Who Was Executed at Peterborough, on Monday the 4th, of May, for an Unnatural Crime*.

of contacting the authorities. Poor sodomites were part of neighbourhoods and communities, including communities of faith, and drew upon the support of both friends and family.

### “...If You Love Me Now... My Heart will Ever be Set Upon You”: Love, Sodomy, and the Poor.

These words were written in a love letter from the Rev. John Church, then the preacher at the Obelisk Chapel, St. George’s Fields, to his “dearest Ned,” the chapel’s young attendant. Of their relationship, which lasted four months, all that is known is preserved in two letters from March 1809.<sup>460</sup> Church was a Baptist preacher; abandoned on the steps of St. John’s Church (for which he was named) and apprenticed to a carver and gilder. He was largely self-taught, and his theology frequently got him in trouble with more established preachers.<sup>461</sup> It was his relationships with young men, however, that would see him in trouble with the law.<sup>462</sup> James Cook, the owner of the White Swan in Vere Street, identified him as the “gay parson,” who performed marriages at the Swan, and sent him love letters.<sup>463</sup>

---

<sup>460</sup> Most of the scholarship about the Rev. Church has been done by Rictor Norton, who devotes an entire chapter to him. Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House*, chapter 13.

<sup>461</sup> Church, *The Foundling; or, the Child of Providence*.

<sup>462</sup> Ian McCormick, ed., “The Infamous Life of John Church, the St. George’s Fields Preacher. From His Infancy up to His Trial and Conviction, with His Confession, Sent in a Letter to the Rev. Mr. L----. Two Days after His Attack on Adam Foreman, at Vauxhall, with Clerical Remarks by the Same Gentlemen; to Which Is Added, His Love Epistles to E\*\*\*\*\* B\*\*\*\*\*. Together with Various Other Letters, Particularly to One Cook, of Vere-Street Notoriety [1817],” in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850.*, vol. Volume 2: Sodomy. (London: Routledge, 2000), 257–79. This sensationalized biography of Church includes several situations in which he was suspected, accused or tried for sodomitical practices.

<sup>463</sup> Ian McCormick, ed., “Religion & Morality Vindicated, Against Hypocrisy and Pollution; or, an Account of the Life and Character of John Church the Obelisk Preacher,” in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850*, vol. 2: Sodomy (London: Routledge, 2000), 220.

## Marriage, Sex and Family: Love In and Out of the Molly-Houses.

Since sodomy was by its very nature criminal, it easily absorbed other criminal activities. As has been seen in the previous chapter, while many of the sodomites who regularly attended molly houses found partners unassisted, the landlord often assisted by pimping for poor men who wished to supplement their income. Within the (relatively) safe space of the molly house, poor sodomites replicated many of the important milestones of a woman's life: Samuel Stephens, one of the evidences against Gabriel Lawrence, attested to "marrying,"<sup>464</sup> and James Dalton also describes a wedding, complete with bridesmaids.<sup>465</sup> According to the landlord of the White Swan in Vere Street, the Rev. John Church performed marriages there as well.<sup>466</sup> As will be seen in Chapter 4, mollies imitated childbirth, and loved to gossip about their husbands and children. Even outside the molly houses, longer-term relationships tended to mirror the financial/sexual power dynamics of marriage. At the Old Bailey in 1732, William Curtis alleged that John Ashford, after they had been sleeping in the same bed for over a month, kissed him and called him "his dear Billy", promising to support him financially; the two would engage in intimate relations for the next year. Ashford was eventually acquitted, because Curtis admitted that he had

---

<sup>464</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1726, trial of Gabriel Lawrence (t17260420-64). Stephen Shapiro raises an interesting point on this topic. As John Rule has shown, 'chapel' and 'marry' were artisan slang for the workplace and its activities. Shapiro suggests that the use of these terms by the mollies may be drawn from a labour context, rather than a romantic/religious one. Cf. John Rule, *The Experience of Labour in Eighteenth-Century Industry* (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 196, 198; Shapiro, "Of Mollies: Sex and Same-Sex Sexualities in the Eighteenth Century," 162.

<sup>465</sup> James Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative of All the Street Robberies Committed since October Last, by James Dalton, and His Accomplices* (London: Printed and sold by J. Roberts, at the Warwick-Arms in Oxford Lane, 1728), 37–39.

<sup>466</sup> McCormick, "The Infamous Life of John Church," 260–61.

perjured himself in his initial statement, out of a desire to protect Ashford.<sup>467</sup> Robert Carlton and John Lincoln lived together for several years, with Carlton supporting Lincoln financially; Carlton's giving Lincoln his tailoring tools suggests a desire to provide for Lincoln after his death. On board the *Africaine*, Rafaelo Seraco and John Westerman seem to have had an extremely intimate relationship: marine William Dane reported that Westerman could frequently be found sitting in Seraco's lap or sitting together with Seraco's arms around him. Seraco would call him his dear, kiss him and hug him, wash his clothes for him, and "treat him as though he were a girl."<sup>468</sup>

As Carlton's jealousy of Mary Frost had soured his relationship with George Lincoln, Rafael Seraco expressed a great deal of jealousy along with his love for Westerman. By all accounts, Westerman enjoyed sex, the gifts he was given by men. He had multiple partners on board the ship. Thomas Bottomy swore that Westerman was also involved with Rafael Treake, that "he has seen Treake kiss Westerman a good many times, Treake used to save up pieces of meat and such like for Westerman from the Gentlemen's dinners, and treat him like a favourite Girl."<sup>469</sup>

According to John Charles, Seraco was extremely jealous of Westerman being involved with other men:

he heard Seraco threatening to beat Westerman, having as he alleged seen him going into the Midshipmans' Cabin with Mr. Beauchamp, and he accused him of being connected

---

<sup>467</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1732, trial of John Ashford (t17320906-68).

<sup>468</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of W. Dane, 11 Dec 1815); ADM 1/5452 (Court Martial of R. Seraco and J. Westerman, 30 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>469</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of Thomas Bottomy, 13 Dec. 1815), TNA.

with Beauchamp - that Westerman denied and said he had only been for his jacket, which Seraco said was a mere excuse for he saw how it was.<sup>470</sup>

Seraco himself testified to having seen Westerman together with Beauchamp.<sup>471</sup> He also claimed to have never been guilty of sodomy at all. He stated that Westerman had repeatedly asked him, but he denied him.

## Friendship

Sodomitical communities also provided many of the supports of family and friendship.

Sodomites (and their friends) spoke for each other in legal contexts. Margaret Clap, who owned a molly house in Holborn in 1726, spoke on behalf of a man named Derwin and helped him gain an acquittal.<sup>472</sup> When William Chumley was brought before Sir John Barnard, the sitting alderman at Guildhall, for being caught in sodomitical practices on Ludgate-hill, he had his friend Joseph Stevens serve as a character reference – but a gentleman in the crowd recognized Stevens as a sodomite, and agreed to prosecute. Both men were released from prison in March of 1751, when the prosecutor failed to appear at their trial.<sup>473</sup>

---

<sup>470</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of John Charles, 14 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>471</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of Rafael Seraco, 14 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>472</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1726, trial of Margaret Clap (t17260711-54).

<sup>473</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post*, 29 Oct – 1 Nov 1750; *General Advertiser (1744)*, 1 Nov 1750; *Old England*, 3 Nov. 1750; *Remembrancer (1747)*, 3 Nov. 1750; City of London Sessions Papers, Justice's Working Documents, 4<sup>th</sup> March 1751, *London Lives*, LMSLPS150620014-5.

## Family

Accused poor men also drew on biological family for emotional support. Porter William Huggins was married with a pregnant wife when he was convicted of sodomitical assault in 1707;<sup>474</sup> and William Griffin's final thoughts were for his children, a boy and girl. He praised them as being well-behaved, and hoped "that the World would not be so unjust to upbraid his poor Children with his unfortunate Death."<sup>475</sup> Blasdale, convicted of sodomy at Nottingham in 1744, had a wife and two or three young children.<sup>476</sup> Fourteen-year-old Thomas Finley, seen in the previous chapter, called upon his father in his attempt to defend himself from a charge of consenting to sodomy. Finley had only been a member of the crew of *Ocean*, or indeed in the Service, for three weeks, and most of the officers had no knowledge of him prior to his arrest. His father attempted to establish him as a dutiful, loyal son. In Finley's case, this was not terribly successful: Lt. Orfleur, who had received Finley's initial confession, had already reported to the Court that Finley had run away to sea, and that he used to spend time in Bird-Cage Walk. His father's testimony, which was that he had behaved dutifully to his parents,<sup>477</sup> rang rather hollow: Thomas Finley was hanged on 27 July 1761 at the Nore.<sup>478</sup> Adam Brooks, hanged for sodomy at Lancaster in 1810, left behind a wife and five children.<sup>479</sup>

---

<sup>474</sup> *The Tryal and Conviction of Several Reputed Sodomites, before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, and Recorder of London, at Guild-Hall, the 20th Day of October, 1707.* (London: Sold by J. Morphew, 1707).

<sup>475</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate's Account, May 1726 (OA17260509).

<sup>476</sup> *Derby Mercury*, 13-20 July 1744.

<sup>477</sup> ADM 1/5300 (Court Martial of George Newton and Thomas Finley, 2 July 1761), TNA.

<sup>478</sup> *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 27-29 July 1761; *London Chronicle*, 28-30 July 1761; *London Evening Post*, 28-30 July 1761; *St. James' Chronicle*, 28-30 July 1761. Finley's case is discussed in detail in Burg, *Boys at Sea: Sodomy, Indecency, and Courts Martial in Nelson's Navy*.

<sup>479</sup> *Lancaster Gazette*, 28 April 1810.



## ‘I Have Ever Since Despised and Hissed at [Him]’: Hatred and Sodomy among the Poor.

When Jeremiah Hargrave, the owner of the Rainbow Coffee-house in Cornhill, first heard the news that John Lowther had been taken up for an assault with sodomitical intent in the summer of 1761, he was not at all surprised. He testified later that he had despised Lowther for years, after having found him standing very close to Deputy Ellis’ footman (who had a reputation of being involved in sodomitical activities); ever since, he told the court, he had hissed at the prisoner whenever he saw him.<sup>480</sup> On board the H.M.S. *Africaine*, both Rafael Seraco and John Westerman had bad reputations. Mizentopman John Clarke deposed that Westerman “had the character of being the worst boy in the ship at that way,”<sup>481</sup> and William Copely, the Carpenter’s Yeoman, admitted that he used to wash Westerman’s clothes for him, and was teaching him to read and write, until he learned that Westerman was keeping company with Seraco “who had a bad name.” After that, he would have nothing to do with him.<sup>482</sup> William Dane testified that Seraco used to pull off his marine’s jacket before going below, so as not to be recognized, “for

---

<sup>480</sup> *The Tryal of Mr. John Lowther, for Assault on John Bushnell, with an Intent to Commit the Crime of Sodomy: At an Adjournment of the General Sessions of the Peace, at Guild-Hall, the 7th of October, 1761* (London: Printed for J. Scott, 1761).

<sup>481</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of John Clarke, 13 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>482</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of William Copely, 14 Dec. 1815), TNA. Interestingly, Copely admits he did not stop doing so until the ship arrived at Manila, even though John Westerman had already been turned out of his position as the Captain’s servant for being involved in sodomitical activities with a midshipman named Robert Garroway (who was turned off the ship). It was only when he heard that Westerman was keeping time with Seraco that he ceased his connection with Westerman. Adam Jackson, the Carpenter, believed that his teaching Westerman to write was ‘a mere pretence, and that they were too familiar together.’ ADM 1/2427 (Examination of Adam Jackson, 18 Dec. 1815), TNA.

he was so well known as a Sodomite, that the people when they saw him used to sign out ‘here he comes’.”<sup>483</sup>

When cases such as that of Cooper, Lowther, or the men of the *Africaine* came to light, magistrates (or in the latter case, the Judge Advocate) often were perplexed at the reactions of the poor to sodomites: why, if they knew and hated the men who behaved so, did they not report the men to the authorities? For the victims of sexual assault, they could easily justify their failure to do so out of fear (this will be discussed in Chapter 3); but witnesses often found themselves on the defensive, lest their testimony be taken as either fabricated in malice to the accused or as approving or supporting the crime. The four crewmembers of the *Adamant* who had discovered John Morris and William Savage in the act were repeatedly queried as to whether they had had any quarrel with either men.<sup>484</sup> Seaman Peter Rich, who overheard them in the very act of sodomy, was indignant, telling the court that “something was carried on that was not right ... it was a damned shame.” However, he observed the two only briefly after they were taken into custody, then “went forward to the foremost berth and took no further notice.” William Green, who first sounded the alarm, and was among the small group who stood by observing the two men copulate, told Savage that he thought the entire matter would be “hushed up.” While Morris was found guilty, and sentenced to be hanged, Savage (who was too drunk to fully consent) was acquitted.<sup>485</sup>

---

<sup>483</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Examination of William Dane, 11 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>484</sup> ADM 1/5343 (Court Martial of John Morris and William Savage, 9 Jan. 1798), TNA.

<sup>485</sup> ADM 1/ 5343 (Morris-Savage Court Martial, 9 Jan. 1797), TNA

Many of the assignations aboard the *Africaine* were in the evening, and in places where there were multiple witnesses. Only rarely did the witnesses report what they had seen to the Captain or other officers.<sup>486</sup> Emmanuel Cruz explained he did not complain of Seraco and Westerman because “there were plenty of Englishmen who knew it, and I thought I would not notice it until I got an Englishman to notice it with me.”<sup>487</sup> When testifying against Rafael Troyac (alias Treake), Cruz explained that he did not report it because he was “at a loss as to who to report it to.”<sup>488</sup> William Dane “did not like to go and complain all by myself” and James Cooper was waiting for someone else to report it first. Samuel Magee, who had served with Seraco for better than nine years, told the Court that “it was every Body’s suspicions, the way he and Westerman were seen together, they talked of it greatly, but did not speak out.”<sup>489</sup> All of these men were accused of sodomy themselves, some by their own confession; they did not report what they knew until they were placed in irons and trading information for their lives.

### “Reserved for Their Own Use”: Hatred, Violence, and the Poor

While poor people were often not particularly concerned with reporting sodomitical actions to the authorities, they still took advantage of the opportunity when granted, of expressing hatred and vengeance. The public identification of the presence of a sodomite, as well as the publicly sanctioned opportunity of the pillory, provided such opportunities. Newspapers, broadsides and pamphlets take care to emphasize the hatred of the poor. Authorities, fearful of the vengeance of

---

<sup>486</sup> Burg, *Boys at Sea: Sodomy, Indecency, and Courts Martial in Nelson’s Navy*, 141–44.

<sup>487</sup> ADM 1/5452 (Court Martial of Rafael Seraco and John Westerman, 30 Dec. 1815), TNA.

<sup>488</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Court Martial of Rafael Treake and Joseph Hubbard, 5 Jan. 1816), TNA.

<sup>489</sup> ADM 1/5452 (Court Martial of Rafael Seraco and John Westerman, 30 Dec. 1815), TNA.

the mob, assigned 40 soldiers and 4 officers to protect school teacher Isaac Broderick at Ratcliff in 1730,<sup>490</sup> and the Beadle of the Sadler's Company, William Holywell, was so badly injured that he had to be taken down only 35 minutes into his sentence; he died in Newgate a few months later.<sup>491</sup> While it was Gentlemen of the public house who turned a sodomite out, where he was 'well mobbed', pelted, and beat through the streets of Norwich; it was the Butchers who dragged him through the filth of their beast-pen, till he was almost suffocated.<sup>492</sup> Sodomite Thomas Blair died of injuries sustained at the pillory at Cheapside, London in 1743.<sup>493</sup> When George Briton, sailor, was pilloried for attempted sodomy with James Smith (a boy under 12) at Portsmouth, the *Penny London Post* highlights the reaction of the sailors, "who threw Eggs, Turnips, Oranges, Apples, and several Stones, besides Mud and other Filth."<sup>494</sup> When "two fellows" were detected in sodomitical practices in Pancras-Fields, they were seized by three tailors and a butcher. They clearly did not have a very strong hold on them, as one man escaped, and the other was "rescued" (i.e. seized and subjected to violence) by a numerous mob in Covent Garden.<sup>495</sup>

While authorities were clearly aware that violence at the pillory was often fatal, and therefore provided guards and constables to try and calm the crowd, these methods were not always very

---

<sup>490</sup> *Grub Street Journal*, 21 May 1730; *Daily Journal*, 26 May 1730; *British Journal* (1729), 30 May 1730; *Weekly Journal* (*British Gazetteer*), 30 May 1730; *Caledonian Mercury*, 2 June 1730.

<sup>491</sup> *London Evening Post*, 17-19 Dec. 1730; *Daily Courant*, 19 Dec. 1730; *Daily Post*, 19 Dec. 1730; *Daily Courant*, 21 Dec. 1730; *London Journal*, 26 Dec. 1730; *Grub Street Journal*, 24 Dec. 1730; *Daily Courant*, 6 Jan. 1731.

<sup>492</sup> *Old Whig*, 27 Jan. 1737.

<sup>493</sup> *General Evening Post*, 12-15 Feb. 1743; *Daily Advertiser*, 15 Feb. 1743; *Daily Gazetteer*, 15 Feb. 1743; *London Daily Post*, 15 Feb. 1743; *London Morning Advertiser*, 16 Feb. 1743; *Common Sense*, 19 Feb. 1743; *Country Journal* (*Craftsman*), 19 Feb. 1743; *Westminster Journal*, 19 Feb. 1743. While Blair was clearly suffering due to his time in prison (he was a month into his six-month sentence), coming to the pillory 'weak' and 'almost naked', his death was very likely caused by the violence he experienced in the pillory – he was knocked unconscious, and died that very night in Newgate.

<sup>494</sup> *Penny London Post*, 22 March 1749.

<sup>495</sup> *London Evening Post*, 14 Oct. 1752.

effective. In 1763, Daniel Lobley was killed by the mob during his stint in the pillory at Stratford; the Coroner's report determined it was a willful murder, but authorities did not know who had cast the fatal stone.<sup>496</sup> In April of 1780, two men convicted of sodomitical behavior, a plasterer named Theodosius Reade and a Hackney coachman named William Smith, were serving their time at the pillory when Smith was struck in the head by a stone. With blood streaming down his face, he and Reade were taken down from the pillory – but Smith later died of his injuries. Reade was also so badly injured that his survival was despaired of.<sup>497</sup> At the pillorying of the men of Vere St., mentioned above, the Butchers are also mentioned as being particularly violent towards sodomites. Despite the presence of the Sheriffs and City Marshals, and nearly 200 Constables, the six men found themselves pelted with horrific items. The butchers "...constantly supplied the party of attack, chiefly consisting of women, with tubs of blood, garbage, and ordure from their slaughter-houses, and with this ammunition, plentifully diversified with dead cats, turnips, potatoes, addled eggs, and other missiles, the criminals were incessantly pelted to the last moment."<sup>498</sup>

One of the men who observed the death of William Smith in 1780 was James Maitland, the 8th Earl of Lauderdale. In 1815, arguing in the House of Lords for the abolition of the pillory as a punishment, he referred to the case of William Smith, which he had observed years previously.

---

<sup>496</sup> *London Evening Post*, 2-5 April 1763; *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 4-6 April 1763; *London Chronicle*, 5-7 April 1763; *Public Advertiser*, 12 April 1763.

<sup>497</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post*, 8-11 Apr. 1780; *Public Advertiser*, 10 Apr. 1780; *Morning Chronicle*, 11 Apr. 1780; *London Courant*, 11 Apr. 1780; *General Evening Post*, 11-13 Apr. 1780; *Morning Chronicle*, 12 Apr. 1780; *Adams's Weekly Courant*, 18 Apr. 1780.

<sup>498</sup> *The Times*, 28 Sept. 1810.

His objection rested on the fact that the behavior of the crowd could cause the punishment to either be too lenient, or too severe, such as

... when the punishment of the pillory was inflicted for crimes which had a tendency to inflame the feelings of the populace, such as the attempting to commit an unnatural and horrible crime. Neither the law nor the judge intended that this crime, abominable as it was, should be punished with death, and yet such was frequently the result. The death too, that such criminals met with was more severe than the punishment of death when inflicted the ordinary way. He himself [the Earl of Lauderdale] had witnessed an instance of this in 1780. A person was pilloried in Southwark for an unnatural crime, and the criminal by the fall of the pillory was killed.<sup>499</sup>

## Conclusion

The case of Robert Carlton and John Lincoln, described at the beginning of this chapter, reveals a lot about love in sodomitical relationships. It reveals that, if the connection was not too public, men could pursue loving, committed relationships even far outside the (relative) safety of the molly subculture of London. It also reveals some of the dangers of doing so: the stress of keeping a major part of one's life secret can be overwhelming, and, with sodomy a capital crime, ex-lovers could easily become sources of downfall. The criminalization of sodomy also caused many encounters between men to be opportunistic and casual, rather than long-term and loving.

It is perhaps in the discourses surrounding love and sodomy that the future erosion of all positive emotions from the homosexual can be traced. Earlier in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the sodomite, while sinful, was still capable of love for family and for friends, even of faith in God. This began to

---

<sup>499</sup> *Caledonian Mercury*, 10 July 1815. William Smith's employer was likely the father of Richard Burrell, a master-hackney man and stable owner. In 1787, Burrell had two men, Hyser and Ellison, extort money from him by threatening to accuse him with sodomy. In his testimony at the Old Bailey, he informed the court that one of his father's hackney coachmen had died 'about nine years ago' while in the pillory for unnatural practices. *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, May 1787, trial of GEORGE HYSER GEORGE ELLISON (t17870523-17).

shift by the middle of the century, and by the end of the period, the emotion of love was defined in such a way as to exclude those who engaged in acts considered against nature and society. At the same time, all positive emotions were increasingly seen as being the result of conjugal love. If all positive emotions sprang from heterosexual desire and conjugal love, which sodomites were, by definition, incapable of, sodomites were therefore incapable of positive emotions.

Similarly, the hatred of sodomites, generated by disgust and fear, was justified, even encouraged, as a defence of society, love and of women. This virulent hatred, and the spontaneous acts of violence it inspired, were enough to stop those people who objected, such as Jeremy Bentham, from making their thoughts known.

## Chapter 3

### Hope and Fear / Gratitude and Anger

During his two-year sentence for attempting sodomy with Adam Foreman at Croydon in 1817, the Rev. John Church struggled with numerous emotions: sorrow (discussed in the next chapter), fear, anger, hope and gratitude. Writing to a friend and congregant, Church described a particularly bad night a few weeks into his imprisonment. He was overcome with the weight of his fear that his actions were a sin too large for God's grace to forgive, "all was dark within, except sin and the anger of God – these were clear enough; horror overwhelmed me, and I sunk low at the footstool of divine mercy; I feared, I trembled, I was brought low, ... What a state to be in!"<sup>500</sup> Even in his desolation, hope did not forsake him. As he observed to Mr. K[in]g,

although I really was filled with fear lest I should be cut off, yet at this very time the Lord gently led my mind, or rather brought the following words, very softly to my heart; they were at first seemingly at a distance, but drew nearer as I listened and observed them. The words were, "I have caused thine iniquities to pass from thee, and have clothed thee with change of raiment." I observed, my mind could not gladly receive this sentence, fearing presumption – but they still followed me, and abode with me, till the horror, terror, fears, and darkness gradually dispersed, and my mind was able so far to receive them as to cause a present ease, which continued with me a few days longer.

From his own experience, in this and several other times in his life, hope is the gift granted to believers, one for which the greatest gratitude is due. God leads his followers to the "kind words of the Saviour in the Gospel." These "draw the heart," and, through faith "hope springs up, and the fears of death and hell, with a sense of God's anger, gradually abate." For Church, gratitude

---

<sup>500</sup> John Church to Mr. K--g, Aug. 10, 1818. Printed in John Church, *The Voice of Faith in the Valley of Achor. Vol. 1 [1820]*, Project Gutenberg Edition, vol. 1, 2 vols., 2019, <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/58616>. The following quotations are from the same letter.



is due to God not only for the shield of hope, but for the fear of sin and the awareness of God's anger, which "meeken, soften, and humble the heart; rendering it also teachable and grateful."<sup>501</sup>

## Hope and Fear, Gratitude and Anger: The Academy

Fear is the first emotion expressed by a human in the Bible – after eating from the forbidden fruit, Adam hides from God, later confessing he did so because he was afraid.<sup>502</sup> God responds in anger. As punishment for Adam's fear and rebellion, God casts him and Eve out of the Garden of Eden, and places curses on them both. Hope and anger feature in some of the earliest of European literature. According to Hesiod, hope was delivered to mortals as part of a curse; it was included in a jar filled with evils, spilled by Pandora, the first woman, sent by Zeus as a curse upon humans.<sup>503</sup> The first subject in European literature is anger, the wrath of Achilles at being deprived of his war prize.<sup>504</sup> It is anger, not Achilles, that is the subject of the *Iliad*.<sup>505</sup> While the

---

<sup>501</sup> John Church to Titus Hill Jr., undated [probably April 1818], printed in Church.

<sup>502</sup> Genesis 3:10, "And he [Adam] said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself." The significance of this fact is discussed in Corey Robin, *Fear: The History of a Political Idea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1.

<sup>503</sup> Hesiod relates the story of the origin of women, as punishment to humanity, in his *Theogony* (lines 560-612), and the story of the release of evil and the retention of hope in *Works and Days* (lines 60-105). Hesiod, *Theogony & Works and Days*, trans. Stephanie Nelson and Richard Caldwell (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2015). The question of why hope remained in the jar – is it a blessing or a curse, has been a frequent topic of discussion for philosophers ever since. For a brief overview of this question and its answers, cf. Kristina Callina, Nancy Snow, and Elise D. Murray, "The History of Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives on Hope: Toward Defining Hope for the Science of Positive Human Development," in *The Oxford Handbook of Hope*, ed. Matthew D. Gallagher and Shane J. Lopez (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 9–26.

<sup>504</sup> Homer, *The Iliad of Homer [1715]*, ed. Rev. Theodore Alois Buckley, trans. Alexander Pope, Project Gutenberg Edition from 1899 Buckley Edition (Project Gutenberg, 2006), [page 002], <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/6130/6130-h/6130-h.html>.

<sup>505</sup> Leonard Charles Muellner, *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic, Myth and Poetics* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), 1.

‘negative’ emotions of fear and anger were among the earliest to receive historical study, hope and gratitude have received little historical analysis.

Hope, for example, has long been a key topic in theology and philosophy, and more recently has seen a flurry of research in psychology and medicine.<sup>506</sup> Philosophers and theologians trace the evolution of Western conceptions of hope from the ancient Greeks and Romans, the early Christian church, medieval thought, Reformation, Enlightenment, and modernity.<sup>507</sup> In history, it has seldom been a topic of study in itself; rather, it is considered as part of histories of oppressed peoples, activists, reformers. As James W. Fraser observes, hope is “the enterprise of the agitator and the poet, the organizer and the unorganized more ... than the work of official leaders.”<sup>508</sup> Fraser’s work provides an exception but is limited to case studies in American history.

Fear has been a more frequent topic of historical analysis. Paul Dulumeau’s monumental *Sin and Fear*, published in English translation in 1990, argues that, between the 13<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, religious and intellectual elites used methods of fear to create a cultural obsession with death and the consequences of sin, which became internalised as guilt. Increasing secularization and the

---

<sup>506</sup> For an overview of perspectives of hope in all these disciplines, cf. Jaklin Elliott, “What Have We Done With Hope? A Brief History,” in *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Hope*, by Jaklin Elliott (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2005), 3–45.

<sup>507</sup> For hope in Classical society and literature, cf. Ruth Rothaus Caston and Robert A. Kaster, *Hope, Joy, and Affection in the Classical World* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016).; for the evolution of the concept in Christian ethics, cf. David Elliot, *Hope and Christian Ethics*, New Studies in Christian Ethics (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017). Those interested in hope in Enlightenment and Modern Thought should refer to Alan Mittleman, *Hope in a Democratic Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Remo Bodei, *Geometry of the Passions: Fear, Hope, Happiness: Philosophy and Political Use*, trans. Gianpero W. Doebler (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2018).

<sup>508</sup> James W. Fraser, *A History of Hope: When Americans Have Dared to Dream of a Better Future* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), xiii.

Enlightenment led to a decrease in these appeals to fear by the late 18th century.<sup>509</sup> The last twenty years have seen several excellent studies of fear in Britain and America.<sup>510</sup> Literary scholars consider the rise of gothic literature in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, and particularly of the sexual other.<sup>511</sup> Joseph Crawford considers gothic literature in a different context: the rise of the concept of terrorism in the wake of the French Revolution. He refers to a 1797 essayist, who characterized gothic novels as ‘terrorist novel writing’.<sup>512</sup> Danijela Kambaskovic considers the relationship between anxiety, physical health, and morality in early modern England.<sup>513</sup> Most recently, Bodei explores the emotion in continental Enlightenment philosophy and its usefulness in politics<sup>514</sup>, while Martha Nussbaum discusses the rise of fear as a dominant emotion in Western societies, particularly considering its interplay with other emotions, such as hope, anger, hatred, and disgust.<sup>515</sup>

Gratitude has only recently been examined as an emotion with its own history, though it has a long history in political theory and theology and has been discussed in relation to other emotions.

---

<sup>509</sup> Jean Delumeau, *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries.*, trans. Eric Nicholson (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990).

<sup>510</sup> Paul Newman, *A History of Terror: Fear & Dread through the Ages* (Stroud, UK: Sutton Publishing, 2000); Bourke, *Fear*; Stearns, *American Fear*.

<sup>511</sup> Ruth Bienstock Anolik, ed., *Horrifying Sex: Essays on Sexual Difference in Gothic Literature* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2007).

<sup>512</sup> Joseph Crawford, *Gothic Fiction and the Invention of Terrorism: The Politics and Aesthetics of Fear in the Age of the Reign of Terror* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013). The 1797 essay in question can be found in Anonymous, “Terrorist Novel Writing,” in *The Spirit of the Public Journals for 1797* (London: Printed for R. Phillips, 1798), 223.

<sup>513</sup> Danijela Kambaskovic, “Living Anxiously: The Senses, Society and Morality in Pre-Modern England,” in *Ordering Emotions in Europe, 1100-1800*, ed. Susan Broomhall (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 161–79.

<sup>514</sup> Bodei, *Geometry of the Passions*.

<sup>515</sup> Martha Nussbaum, *The Monarchy of Fear: A Philosopher Looks at Our Political Crisis* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2018).

William Ian Miller, in his examination of gift-giving in medieval Scandinavia (and twentieth-century America), finds a fine line between gratitude and shame.<sup>516</sup> Edward Harpham charts the history of gratitude as philosophical and religious concepts in Western history,<sup>517</sup> while Peter Leithart, in his conceptual history of gratitude in European intellectual life, conceives of gratitude as either a circle, with return always expected; or a line – gifts received through grace, gift of Jesus.<sup>518</sup> Leithart argues that gratitude has mainly been understood as a circle, with three key disruptions, where the ‘line’ took precedence: “the disruption of early Christianity, the disruption of the Reformation, and the disruption of the Enlightenment.”<sup>519</sup> Others have considered the uses of gratitude as a source of power: George Boulukos argues that the frequent image of the grateful slave in 18<sup>th</sup>- and early 19<sup>th</sup>-century novels, while seemingly sympathetic, reinforced slavery by showing the slave as willingly accepting their situation.<sup>520</sup> Adam Potkay considers the role of both pity and gratitude in reinforcing social structures.<sup>521</sup>

Anger has received perhaps the most extensive treatment of the four emotions surveyed in this chapter, with much of the discussion concerned with anger management. In one of the earliest works of emotions history, Peter and Carol Stearns examine letters and deportment manuals to

---

<sup>516</sup> William Ian Miller, *Humiliation: And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort and Violence* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993).

<sup>517</sup> Edward J. Harpham, “Gratitude in the History of Ideas,” in *The Psychology of Gratitude*, ed. Robert A. Emmons and Michael E. McCullough (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 9–36.

<sup>518</sup> Peter J. Leithart, *Gratitude: An Intellectual History* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014).

<sup>519</sup> Leithart, 5.

<sup>520</sup> George Boulukos, *The Grateful Slave: The Emergence of Race in Eighteenth-Century British and American Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

<sup>521</sup> Adam Potkay, “Contested Emotions: Pity and Gratitude from the Stoics to Swift and Wordsworth,” *PMLA* 130, no. 5 (2015): 1332–46; Adam Potkay, “Pity, Gratitude, and the Poor in Rousseau and Adam Smith,” *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 46 (2017): 163–82.

understand changing attitudes towards anger in 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century America.<sup>522</sup> Anger has been examined for antiquity,<sup>523</sup> the middle ages,<sup>524</sup> and early modern period.<sup>525</sup> For the Enlightenment, Patrick Coleman considers anger in continental philosophy, while Tamas Demeter considers the intersections of medical and philosophic views of anger in the Scottish Enlightenment.<sup>526</sup>

## Hope and Fear, Gratitude and Anger in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Thought

Hope, fear, gratitude and anger are closely linked to many of the emotions surveyed here. Desire and aversion easily inspire either hope (for things or people desired), or fear (for things unwanted); desires granted unlooked for inspire joy and gratitude; fears realised or hopes dashed evoke grief and anger; joy and gratitude often inspire love; grief and anger are often transmuted into hatred; and if displaying proper gratitude could be a source of pride, failing to do so, as well

---

<sup>522</sup> Stearns and Stearns, *Anger*.

<sup>523</sup> Muellner, *The Anger of Achilles*; Susanna Morton Braund and Glenn W. Most, eds., *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, Yale Classical Studies, v. 32 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Harris, *Restraining Rage*; Kostas Kalimtzis, *Taming Anger: The Hellenic Approach to the Limitations of Reason* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012).

<sup>524</sup> Rosenwein, *Anger's Past*.

<sup>525</sup> Carol Zisowitz Stearns, "'Lord Help Me Walk Humbly': Anger and Sadness in England and America, 1570-1750," in *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*, ed. Carol Zisowitz Stearns and Peter N. Stearns (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1988), 39-68; Gwynne Kennedy, *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000); Linda A. Pollock, "Anger and the Negotiation of Relationships in Early Modern England," *Historical Journal* 47, no. 3 (2004): 567-90; Karl A.E. Enenkel and Anita Traninger, eds., *Discourses of Anger in the Early Modern Period*, Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

<sup>526</sup> Patrick Coleman, *Anger, Gratitude, and the Enlightenment Writer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Tamas Demeter, "Anger and the Unity of Philosophy: Interlocking Discourses of Natural and Moral Philosophy in the Scottish Enlightenment," in *Discourses of Anger in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Karl A.E. Enenkel and Anita Traninger, Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 238-58.

as actions taken under the influence of either fear or anger, could be causes of shame. This subsection shall consider the role of hope, fear, gratitude and anger in 18th-century thought.

“Hope and fear are the bane of human life,” observed John Fielding, “these two inseparable passions look forward, and like the guard and prisoner tread on each other’s heels; and where one is, the other must be also: for where fear is not, it is no longer hope but certainty, and where hope is not, it is no longer fear but despair.”<sup>527</sup> The key element of both hope and fear is uncertainty; as David Hume commented, “When either good or evil is uncertain, it gives rise to fear or hope, according to the degrees of uncertainty on the one side or the other.”<sup>528</sup>

Hope is the “looking for anything to come,”<sup>529</sup> and the “expectation of future good”.<sup>530</sup> Nathan Bailey listed it as “an affection of the Mind that keeps it stedfast [sic], and from being born away or hurried into Despair by the violence of present Evils, by a well grounded Expectation of being extricated out of them in time, and thence it is called the anchor of the Soul.”<sup>531</sup> As a verb, Samuel Johnson highlighted the elements of futurity and desire.<sup>532</sup> Writing at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, James Barclay distinguished between hope and expectation, “what we *hope* for seems to be more a favour or a kindness; what we *expect*, more a duty or obligation.”<sup>533</sup> Fear was often defined by synonyms; for John Kersey, it meant “awe, dread, or fright.”<sup>534</sup> Nathan Bailey saw it

---

<sup>527</sup> John Fielding, *The Universal Mentor; Containing, Essays on the Most Important Subjects in Life*. (London: Printed for A. Millar, 1763), 117.

<sup>528</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 439.

<sup>529</sup> John Kersey, *A New English Dictionary* (London: Printed for Henry Bonwicke, at the Red Lion, and Robert Knaplock, at the Angel in St. Paul’s Church-Yard, 1702), 118.

<sup>530</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 462.

<sup>531</sup> Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*, 351.

<sup>532</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 1014–15.

<sup>533</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1792, dlxxiii.

<sup>534</sup> Kersey, *A New English Dictionary*, 1702, 94.

as “dread, or fright,” but also the ‘apprehension of evil.’<sup>535</sup> Samuel Johnson also listed dread as a key aspect, and defined fear as a “painful apprehension of danger,” or as the “dejection of mind at the presence of any person or thing.” Johnson’s dictionary, unlike those from the first half of the century, included anxiety in his definition.<sup>536</sup> For John Ash, fear was “dread, horror,” and “anxiety”;<sup>537</sup> while for Barclay, to fear was to “apprehend evil,” in both persons and things.<sup>538</sup>

David Hume considered hope and fear to result from the passions of joy and grief, mixed with uncertainty.<sup>539</sup> Alexander Forbes argued instead that they were the results of desire and aversion, mixed with reason, and were nature’s way of ensuring the health of the body; hope keeps the human being constantly striving for betterment, while fear causes avoidance of things harmful. According to Forbes, it was only when hope or fear were realized that joy or grief emerged.<sup>540</sup>

Fear especially was of concern, since no other passion “so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning.”<sup>541</sup> Burke argued that fear, being the apprehension of pain or death, caused people to react as if experiencing physical pain.<sup>542</sup> Forbes considered that fear was not shameful in itself, but only if it caused one to do something shameful, or to fail to do their duty.<sup>543</sup> John Fielding considered it an even more effecting curb on human behavior than shame;

---

<sup>535</sup> Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*, 277.

<sup>536</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 742.

<sup>537</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 363.

<sup>538</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1792, cdxlix.

<sup>539</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 443–44.

<sup>540</sup> Alexander Forbes, *Moral and Philosophical Essays on Several Subjects* (London: Printed for T. Longman, 1762), 46–47.

<sup>541</sup> Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry Into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, The Fifth Edition (London: J. Dodsley, 1767), 57.

<sup>542</sup> Burke, 131.

<sup>543</sup> Forbes, *Moral and Philosophical Essays on Several Subjects*, 47.

for “shame can have no effect but where there are some remains of virtue; but fear has always an influence over us, as we are always sensible of pain.”<sup>544</sup>

“Of all the crimes that human creatures are capable of committing, the most horrid and unnatural is ingratitude,” observed David Hume, “especially when it is committed against parents. ... This is acknowledg’d by all mankind, philosophers as well as the people.”<sup>545</sup> Perhaps unsurprisingly in a deeply hierarchical society, where patronage was a key aspect of political and economic life, gratitude was an extremely important emotion. As a result of the social changes of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, many thinkers considered it a virtue that was disappearing. Kersey’s dictionary (1702) does not contain gratitude; it was an unspoken reality. Bailey in 1732 defines it as a “virtue in the Receiver of a Benefit, by which he demonstrates, that the kindness was acceptable to him, and upon that score entertains a hearty Respect for the Author of it, seeking all Occasions to requite him.”<sup>546</sup> Johnson is more succinct, summarising it as “duty to benefactors” or a “desire to return benefits.”<sup>547</sup> For both Ash and Barclay, gratitude consisted of acknowledging favours or benefits received, and a readiness to return it with similar behaviour.<sup>548</sup> Adam Smith problematized the moral sentiment of gratitude; not all benefactors deserved gratitude. Gratitude was only rightly bestowed when the beneficence was freely given, without any self-interested motive for the giver.<sup>549</sup> While gratitude was a socially valuable sentiment, and one that was necessary, in

---

<sup>544</sup> Fielding, *The Universal Mentor; Containing, Essays on the Most Important Subjects in Life.*, 63.

<sup>545</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 466.

<sup>546</sup> Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*, 327.

<sup>547</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 933.

<sup>548</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 423.

<sup>549</sup> Potkay, “Pity, Gratitude and the Poor,” 164.



Smith's thinking, it was only so if the motives of the giver were truly generous.<sup>550</sup> Most elites would not have approved of their social inferiors deciding whether gratitude is truly owed; like Hume, they considered ingratitude a horrid crime. Thomas Gray portrays Gratitude as a woman: meek, humble, and above all, silent.<sup>551</sup>

If gratitude is meek, passive, and humble, anger is loud, active, and often violent. Both Samuel Johnson in 1755 and encyclopedist John Wilkes in 1810 cited 17th-century Anglican divine Robert South; anger is "a transient hatred, or at least very like it."<sup>552</sup> Silvester Jenks labeled Anger a "passion by itself" because he considered it to have no opposite; but contained most of the other emotions within it.

Anger is in some respect a Passion by it self, because it has no other directly contrary to it. The Evil which provokes it, is always either past or present; and if our Hope be bold enough to undertake Revenge, immediately we fall to work; if yet too fearful, we smother our Anger for a while, in hope of a better Season; bit if our Hope quite fails us, all our Anger ceases; Despair and Grief take place; and these are Passions contrary to Hope and Joy, but not directly opposite to Anger. ... The Foundation of it (as of all the rest) is Love. ... Despair is the only Passion which has no Fellowship with Anger, but only serves to dash it all to pieces, by killing the Hope of Revenge, and burying the Desire of it alive.<sup>553</sup>

Thomas Gordon bewailed anger as an "unreasonable passion."<sup>554</sup> Samuel Johnson defined anger as "uneasiness or discomposure of mind upon the receipt of any injury, with a present purpose of

---

<sup>550</sup> Potkay, 174.

<sup>551</sup> Verse fragment from Mr. Gray's Pocketbook, from Pembroke MSS, c. 1754. Printed in Duncan C. Tovey, ed., *Gray and His Friends: Letters and Relics in Great Part Hitherto Unpublished* (Cambridge: University Press, 1890), 269.

<sup>552</sup> Robert South, *Twelve Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions*, The Sixth Edition, vol. 1 (London: J. Bettenham, 1727), 64. The sermon in question was originally preached to the Lord-Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London, at St. Paul's, November 9<sup>th</sup>, 1662. Cited in Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language [1755]*, 132; Wilkes, *Encyclopaedia Londinensis; or Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Literature.*, 1:698.

<sup>553</sup> Jenks, *Essay upon the Art of Love*, 188–90.

<sup>554</sup> Thomas Gordon, *The Humourist: Being Essays upon Several Subjects.*, vol. 2 (London: Printed for T. Woodward., 1725), 136–37.

revenge.”<sup>555</sup> John Ash defined anger as “a violent passion, resentment of an injury.”<sup>556</sup> For James Barclay, anger involved a desire at thwarting another’s happiness, due to an injury received. He contrasted anger, which implied “a passion more internal and lasting”, from being “in a passion”, which was a “sudden external gust of anger, short and violent.”<sup>557</sup>

Emotions such as anger (and fear) were considered to have physical effects on the body. Cheyne considered “anger and malice” to be “degrees of a frenzy, and a frenzy is one kind of a raging fever.” He determined that “the violent and sudden passions, are more dangerous to health, ... as acute diseases are more destructive than the chronic.”<sup>558</sup> According to Tamas Demeter, Scottish physiologists and philosophers alike were concerned with the management and reduction of passions like anger, as harmful to both the physical and social body.<sup>559</sup>

The passions of hope and fear, gratitude and anger were held to be very powerful ones by 18<sup>th</sup>-century thinkers. Hope was a spur to success and ambition, and a shield against fear and despair. Fear protected the physical body, but actions taken under the cloak of fear could be a source of shame, and, like anger, could have a harmful effect on physical health. Gratitude was essential for the smooth running of society, while anger threatened to tear that society apart.

---

<sup>555</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 131–32.

<sup>556</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 61.

<sup>557</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1792, xcvi.

<sup>558</sup> George Cheyne, *An Essay of Health and Long Life*. (Bath: G. Strahan and J. Leake., 1724), 159.

<sup>559</sup> Demeter, “Anger and the Unity of Philosophy: Interlocking Discourses of Natural and Moral Philosophy in the Scottish Enlightenment.”

## Hope, Fear and Sodomy

In 1781, William Beckford, in a letter to the Countess d'Orsini-Rosenberg in Venice, spun a fantasy in which he and William Courtenay could make love and then die in their sleep. He tells her of the agony of his situation:

Surely there is no hell for me in the other world because I am damned on earth. Do you know of a state more frightening than this which I suffer – spied upon by a thousand Arguses without hearts and without ears, constrained to abandon the unique hope that reconciles me to life, menaced at each instant, accused of the ruin of a being I adore in whom all human affections are concentrated to a point. Such is my present situation, such are the Demons that Destiny has set on my trail.<sup>560</sup>

For Beckford, it was only in death that he could love without fear, but the chance of finding a youth who would love him in turn was the hope to which he clung, despite his fears.

For Beckford, sodomitical love was entwined with death. George Haggerty cites a letter written from Beckford to Courtenay, then only twelve, which starts as a love letter but quickly turns into a threat. He tells his “dearest Willy” of a dream he had, in which they are sitting together in a meadow on a summer’s evening, when two snakes emerge from a hedge, and, twining around both their bodies, the snakes bite them, and Beckford and Courtenay are able to share one last kiss before they die. Beckford then interprets the dream – the snakes are Courtenay’s father and one of his aunts, whom he has already declared ready to do all in their power “to keep us

---

<sup>560</sup> William Beckford to Countess d'Orsini-Rosenberg, written December 1781, in French. Originally published in Alexander, *England's Wealthiest Son*, 263–66. Translated and discussed in Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 145–47. Boyd Alexander believes it is unlikely that Beckford ever sent this letter, but wrote it as a means of sorting out his thoughts and feelings.

asunder.” They “under the appearance of prudence and affection would creep into our bosoms and sting our vitals.”<sup>561</sup>

## Hope, Fear, and Sodomy among the Elite

In January 1811, Charles Skinner Matthews supplied his Cambridge pal Lord Byron (who was in Greece with their mutual friend John Cam Hobhouse) details about the discovery and fall-out of the Vere-street Coterie, as well as other sodomitical scandals of the day. Among the cases he mentioned to Byron was that of Lt. John Newhall Hepburn and his sixteen-year old lover, drummer Thomas White, who were in Newgate prison under sentence of death.<sup>562</sup> Matthews visited Hepburn and White in Newgate, but reported to Byron that he did not consider White particularly attractive, “scarcely worth hanging for.”<sup>563</sup> He compares the situation of those seeking sodomitical encounters in England with that of the Ottoman states: “that which you [Byron] get for 5£ we must risque our necks for; and are content to risque them.”

Matthews comment, that English sodomites were “content” to risk their necks for the chance of sexual and emotional fulfillment, shows how hope can sometimes overcome fear. This subsection will examine how elite sodomites expressed hope and fear in the conflict between their hopes for the future and the fear of a dangerous present.

---

<sup>561</sup> William Beckford to William Courtenay, dated Rome, 1 July 1782. Cited in Guy Chapman, *Beckford*, Second Edition (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1952), 135–36; Haggerty, *Men in Love*, 147–48.

<sup>562</sup> Hepburn and White were hanged 7 March 1811. *Morning Chronicle* 8 March 1811.

<sup>563</sup> Charles Skinner Matthews, to Lord Byron, 13 Jan. 1811. NLS 12604/4247G, made available online by Peter Cochran at <https://petercochran.files.wordpress.com/2009/02/02-mediterranean-1809-181126.pdf>. Byron seems only to have received this letter in June 1811, cf. George Gordon Byron, *Byron's Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of All the Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of All Others*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, vol. 2 (London: J. Murray, 1973), 48–51. Matthews drowned 2 August 1811.

## “A Thousand Arguses without Hearts”: Fear of Discovery

Even attempting to reduce the risk of sodomitical encounters, as has been seen in previous chapters, by primarily engaging in relations with those with significantly less power, either due to youth, wealth, or social capital, still left elite sodomites open to discovery and ruin. It could be difficult to find a safe location; even the most seemingly isolated location could have witnesses, “a thousand Arguses without hearts”, though often with very good ears. Private rooms in public houses were often not nearly as private as one would hope. Capt. Rigby found his ‘private’ encounter with William Minton interrupted, as Minton had arranged for witnesses to be present. Even when witnesses had not been previously arranged for the purposes of entrapment, there was always the risk of people watching from the keyhole. The trial of coachman John Dicks, whose encounter with John Meeson was interrupted in 1722, was seldom out of print throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>564</sup> Despite being in a ‘private’ room, Dicks was observed by three people through “a slit in the Partition ... in the very Act of Sodomy.” One of the witnesses, a woman, horrified by what she observed, cry’d out “I can look no longer – I am ready to swoon – He’ll ruin the Boy!”; leading the other witnesses to rush in and stop him.<sup>565</sup>

Towards the end of John Cleland’s *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1749), his heroine Fanny describes becoming a witness to a sodomitical encounter between two young country gentlemen.<sup>566</sup> Observing them enter the room next to hers, and lock the door, Fanny decides to

---

<sup>564</sup> In addition to the Proceedings, the Trial of John Dicks was included in various editions of *Select Trials at the Sessions House in the Old Bailey* (first published 1734, reprinted 1742), and in the *Tyburn Chronicle* (1768).

<sup>565</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1722, trial of John Dicks (t17220404-29). Given that he was only charged with sodomitical assault, their stopping him before ejaculation likely saved Dicks’ life.

<sup>566</sup> This section can be found in John Cleland, *The Memoirs of Fanny Hill*, A new and genuine edition from the original text (London, 1749) (Paris: Isidore Liseux, 1888), 271–77.

“see what they were, and examine their persons and behaviour.” Not finding any peep holes in the partition, she notices a patch high in the wainscot, “so high, that I was obliged to stand upon a chair to reach it, which I did as soft as possible; and, with a point of a bodkin, soon pierced it, and opened myself espial-room sufficient.” Fanny observes the eldest, a “tall comely young man” of about 19, make a quick search of the room, “probably in too much hurry and heat not to overlook the very small opening I was posted at, especially at the height it was, whilst my eye close to it kept the light from shining through and betraying it,” before proceeding to a “project of preposterous pleasure, at the risk of the very worst of consequences, where a discovery was nothing less than improbable.” Fanny excuses her remaining in place to watch the whole encounter as being motivated “purely that I might gather more facts and certainty against them in my design to do their deserts instant justice,” but, as they are finishing, falls on her face and is knocked unconscious, allowing the young men to escape.

Gentlemen paying attention to servants and younger family members often found their actions were closely observed. As we have seen, when the landlord of the inn in William Goodall’s *Adventures of Captain Greenland* notices Mr. Moggy paying attention to young Silvius, he makes sure to warn Wilful and Silvius.<sup>567</sup> In 1785, a man identified only as Mr. P (recently married to a lady worth £1200 a year, with property near Lewes), was observed paying close attention to the nephew of the landlord of the Angel Inn at Tunbridge Wells. When he later tried to cajole the young man into bed with him, the family were ready to act. He fled the country and

---

<sup>567</sup> Goodall, *The Adventures of Capt. Greenland*, 2:192–94. This scene in the novel is discussed in Chapter 1.

was declared an outlaw at the Kent Lent Assizes.<sup>568</sup> Captain Henry Allen of H.M. Sloop *Rattler* based his defence on the fact that, as Captain, he was frequently observed in his interactions. Even though all his officers admitted he “treated his servants as they ought to be treated,” this did not outweigh the evidence. As seen in Chapter 1, Capt. Allen was executed for sodomy on 15 May 1797.<sup>569</sup>

### “I Fear ... the Society of the Deceased Boy-fancier”: Sodomy and the Betrayal of Sexual Partners

In the best-case situation, where both parties were consenting and desirous of the encounter, there was always the risk that one’s sexual partners would give names to the authorities in exchange for lenity in their own situations. Mark Partridge did so with the men who attended Mother Clap’s molly house; newspaper reports were divided as to whether Arnold and Crutchard (executed in Bristol in 1753) had provided any names before their executions.<sup>570</sup> As will be seen in the next section, the offer of a pardon was held out to Thomas Rix and Isaac Hitchen at Warrington in 1806, if they gave up men of reputation. Commenting on the public execution of John Atwood Eglerton, whom he had previously described as a ‘poor honest sodomite’,<sup>571</sup> William Beckford, having heard that Eglerton had tried to give the names of the gentlemen he

---

<sup>568</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post* 26-29 March 1785; *Morning Herald*, 29 March 1785; *Morning Post*, 29 March 1785; *Public Advertiser*, 29 March 1785. The landlord of the Angel Inn and his nephew are not named, but the *Kentish Gazette*, 30 June 1781 names John Knight as the landlord of the Angel Inn, Tunbridge Wells.

<sup>569</sup> ADM 1/5339 (Court Martial of Captain Henry Allen, 22-24 April 1797), National Archives. For accounts of his execution, cf. *London Chronicle*, 23-26 Sept. 1797; *Bell’s Weekly Messenger*, 24 Sept. 1797; *True Briton*, 25 Sept. 1797; *Morning Chronicle*, 26 Sept. 1797.

<sup>570</sup> According to the *London Evening Post*, 15-18 Sept. 1753; *Public Advertiser*, 18 Sept. 1753; *Read’s Weekly Journal*, 22 Sept. 1753, they refused to give up any accomplices. However, the *Manchester Mercury*, 25 Sept. 1753 reported that they had in fact done so.

<sup>571</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 22 Sept. 1816. Printed in Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 194. Beckford does not give Eglerton’s name, but the date and location of the execution make the reference clear. Cf. Simon Devereaux, Capital Convictions at the Old Bailey Dataset, [https://hcmc.uvic.ca/project/oldbailey/record.php?trial\\_file=6389](https://hcmc.uvic.ca/project/oldbailey/record.php?trial_file=6389)

had been involved with to the Ordinary of Newgate, admitted that he would fear “the society of the deceased boy-fancier, the Newgate-bird.”<sup>572</sup> Despite his fear of men such as Eglerton giving him up, he saves his vitriol for the Ordinary and the blood-thirsty crowd who condemn a man to death for his sexual desires.

### Fear as a Legal Defence.

Elite sodomites who did not flee the country upon detection, but defended themselves in courts of law, often played upon the concept of fear to accuse their accusers of blackmail, robbery, or extortion. Grand juries were frequently composed of gentlemen, who were more inclined to believe that a fellow gentleman had been targeted by nefarious members of the criminal underclass than that they had engaged in sodomy with a servant or social inferior. The increased prosecution of sodomites in the 1690s led to new interpretations of an old crime: blackmail. According to Angus McLaren, the term ‘blackmail’ originally had nothing to do with either reputation or the sending of letters, but was originally used to describe “protection money made to robbers.”<sup>573</sup> In February of 1695, a man named Thomas Lane was fined, and sentenced to stand three times in the pillory for extorting £36 from Mr. Hall, a Merchant, by threatening to accuse him of Buggery;<sup>574</sup> and a clergyman named William Tipping was acquitted after two Irishmen, both named Fitzgerald, accused him of paying them to falsely accuse Captain Rigby of sodomy.<sup>575</sup> As Rictor Norton points out, it is highly likely that Rev. Tipping was a member of the

---

<sup>572</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 3 Oct. 1816. Printed in Beckford, 194–95.

<sup>573</sup> Angus McLaren, *Sexual Blackmail: A Modern History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2002), 12.

<sup>574</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, February 1695, trial of Thomas Lane (t16950220-30).

<sup>575</sup> *Post Man (Historical Account)*, 27-29 July 1699.



SRM, since Captain Rigby had been convicted due to their actions only a few months earlier.<sup>576</sup>

George Skelthorp, hanged for highway robbery in 1709, made a habit of it:

That he knowing the time when, and the places where some Sodomites were resorting about Covent-Garden, he went to stand in their Way, and when any of them would (as they often did) carry him to a By-place thereabouts to commit their foul Acts with him, he went with them; and then he taking hold of them, threaten'd them, that he would presently bring them before a Justice, unless they gave him Satisfaction. By which means (he said) he got a great deal of Money at several times, of such Persons; who rather than suffer themselves to be exposed (some of them being Men of good appearance) gave him either Money, Rings, or Watches, or what else they had then about them.<sup>577</sup>

The Waltham Black Act of 1723 made it a felony to extort money or venison by sending threatening letters, but the threats were against a person's life or property, not reputation.<sup>578</sup> Over the course of the century, extortion was extended to include giving up property under threat of being accused of a serious crime – such as rape, buggery, or bestiality.<sup>579</sup> By the 1770s, oral threats were also considered robbery – in the case of the *King v. Thomas Jones*, prosecutor Mitchel Newman had been extorted of 3 guineas and a further £40 at a later date, based on oral threats to raise a mob and accuse him of sodomy. There was some debate about whether this constituted robbery – the judges decided that Jones having grabbed Newman by the arm, was a 'sufficient degree of force', and sentenced Jones to death.<sup>580</sup> Only a few years later, when James Donally extorted a half a guinea from Charles Fielding, the son of the Earl of Denbigh and

---

<sup>576</sup> Rictor Norton. Ed. "The Trial of Capt. Edward Rigby, 1698." *Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England: A Sourcebook*. Updated 11 July 2013; <http://www.rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/rigby.htm>.

<sup>577</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate's Account, March 1709 (OA17090323).

<sup>578</sup> McLaren, *Sexual Blackmail: A Modern History*, 12.

<sup>579</sup> McLaren, 13. It is worth noting that sodomy was the most serious of the three.

<sup>580</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, February 1776, trial of THOMAS JONES, otherwise EVANS (t17760221-5). *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, May 1776 (17760522). This was later respited to 3 years hard labour, City of London Sessions Papers, Justice's Working Documents, 13<sup>th</sup> September 1776. *London Lives*, LMSLPS150870057.

distant cousin to Sir Henry and Sir John Fielding<sup>581</sup>, Mr. Justice Willes determined that a ‘fear of danger’ was sufficient to constitute a robbery.<sup>582</sup> Due to this decision, Donally was sentenced to death (though he was later pardoned during pleasure).<sup>583</sup> Robert Holloway later insinuated that Donally was Fielding’s paid lover;<sup>584</sup> Randolph Trumbach suggests that the family, while ensuring that young Charles’ blackmailer was prosecuted, sent the young man abroad, where his ‘tastes’ might not embarrass the family.<sup>585</sup> Burke simply lists him as having died unmarried.<sup>586</sup>

## Hope, Fear, and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

In January 1816, after several of their former crewmates were sentenced to death for sodomy, and knowing that the prosecution had in their possession signed confessions to sodomitical behaviour (though denying the commission of sodomy itself), midshipmen William Lockhart Jarratt Cruchley and Christopher Beauchamp, both younger sons of country gentlemen, and James Bruce, the son of a Scottish doctor, desperately tried to find a legal argument that would not only save their necks, but if possible their careers and reputations. Due largely to Cruchley’s

---

<sup>581</sup> Antony Simpson states that Sir John Fielding (who was the committing magistrate in this case) was no relation to Charles: “Blackmail as a Crime of Sexual Indiscretion in Eighteenth-Century England,” in *Crime, Gender, and Sexuality in Criminal Prosecutions*, ed. Louis A. Knafla, Criminal Justice History 17 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002), 69. They were, in fact, distant cousins: Charles Fielding’s great-great-grandfather William Fielding (the 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Denbigh) was the elder brother of Henry and John Fielding’s grandfather, Rev. John Fielding; making Charles Fielding Sir John Fielding’s second cousin twice removed. John Burke, *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire*, Fourth Edition (corrected to 1833), vol. 1 (London: H. Colburn, 1833), 336–38.

<sup>582</sup> *King against Donnally* (1779) 1 Leach 193-194, 197, 198.

<sup>583</sup> SP 44/94, p. 305. Donnally escaped Newgate during the Gordon Riots, but voluntarily turned himself back in. He spent 2 years on the Hulks, and three years in Newgate. Cf. Simon Devereaux, *Capital Convictions at the Old Bailey*, [https://hcmc.uvic.ca/project/oldbailey/record.php?trial\\_file=2680](https://hcmc.uvic.ca/project/oldbailey/record.php?trial_file=2680)

<sup>584</sup> Holloway, “The Phoenix of Sodom, Or, The Vere Street Coterie [1813],” 198.

<sup>585</sup> Trumbach, “Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London,” 188.

<sup>586</sup> Burke, *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire*, 1:338.

connections, they were able to obtain legal counsel, a ‘friend’, to assist them during the court martials. Their solution was to try and get the confessions excluded as evidence, and to cast doubt on the veracity of the primary witness against them, Emanuel Cruz (or Cross), a black Portuguese member of the crew.

Their argument for the exclusion of the signed confessions was that, since they were frightened of the potential disgrace and danger, and hopeful that confessing to a lesser crime would save them, when they made their confessions, the said confessions were therefore invalid, as “it is a settled Rule of Law that Confessions of prisoners be uninfluenced by Fear and unseduced by Hope.”<sup>587</sup> The midshipmen’s claim to having been influenced by fear rested on the physical effects of imprisonment and the fear of the punishment if convicted of sodomy. Christopher Beauchamp described the conditions under which their confessions were made:

... brought under escort of Marines as Prisoners from our Ship where we have been some time confined – Terrified as we were in the idea of being Prosecuted for the horrible Crime imputed to us, dismayed and alarmed – we submitted to an Examination of us separately made, and in the Duress of our Situation, our Minds and Feelings every moment distorted by the Hope and Fear without a Friend to Counsel us, we trembled lest we should undergo our present Prosecution, and in the hope amidst such a concussion of Feelings that an acknowledgement of the Minor Offence of Boyish indecent indiscretion, would answer us Compassion and avert the Evil we feared ...<sup>588</sup>

In his trial fifteen days later, Cruchley would insist that the Confession was obtained

...when I was labouring under an extreme Agitation of Mind and Body in the alarm and fear of the dreadful Punishment annexed to the Horrible Crime imputed to me that I ought

---

<sup>587</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Beauchamp-Bruce Court Martial, 6-15 January 1816). Even though this ploy was unsuccessful for Beauchamp and Bruce, Cruchley attempted it during his second court martial. Cf. ADM 1/5453 (Cruchley 2<sup>nd</sup> Court Martial, 30 Jan. 1816). It was no more successful the second time.

<sup>588</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Beauchamp-Bruce Court Martial, 6-15 January 1816).

not to have been interrogated nor solicited to declare any thing to my own detriment or Prejudice.<sup>589</sup>

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Judge Advocate, J.K. Greetham, dismissed this argument as a “crotchet”<sup>590</sup>; all signed confessions were produced in court.

Given the unsuccessful nature of this attempt, William Cruchley tried a slightly different tactic in his court martial for committing sodomy and uncleanness with Ship’s Boy George Parsons. He argued that the key witness against him, assistant cook Emmanuel Cruz (Cross) committed perjury in the hope of being granted protection as King’s Evidence:

I cannot forbear reminding the Court that Emmanuel Cross on his own Confession was admitted as King’s Evidence – and tho’ others on the former Trials would not say that any hope of Pardon was held out to them to Confess- this Man on the last Trial swore that Mr. Jones when examining him said “If you tell the Truth and everything you know you will be pardoned” and altho’ he was contradicted herein by the Master at Arms who was present when Mr. Jones examined him yet his admitting that he made such a Confession from Understanding and believing from what was said that a Pardon was held out to him, and his swearing now as he has on this Trial that he has not been in Irons since the Promise – by which he could only mean a Pardon – this is quite sufficient in the Law to invalidate the whole of his Testimony whatever it might be, and render him an incredible if not incompetent Witness...<sup>591</sup>

Cruchley went on to point out the numerous discrepancies between Cruz’s initial information and his testimony, the impossibility of his statements; it is likely that, had this case been reported in isolation, rather than as part of a large discovery, it would have been dismissed as malicious. In doing so, Cruchley frequently drew on the fact that Cruz was black, poor, and foreign, as well as a confessed sodomite, to discredit his testimony as malicious perjury:

---

<sup>589</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Cruchley 2<sup>nd</sup> Court Martial, 30 Jan. 1816).

<sup>590</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Beauchamp-Bruce Court Martial, 6-15 Jan. 1816).

<sup>591</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Cruchley-Parsons Court Martial, 16-19 Jan. 1816).

The only Witness as to the Crimes is Emmanuel Cross than whom it is hardly possible for the Mind to conceive of a more depraved and Guilty being in Human Shape! If Possible the Vilest of the Vile, a Sodomite on his own Confession ... An individual who admits himself to be a Renegade, first entering the British Merchant Service, then revolting against this Country, joining the Enemy, fighting against us, is taken Prisoner in the Battle of Trafalgar, and whilst a Prisoner, again admitted into our Service. – An individual whose very looks and manners are hellish, not only assimilated to the Horrible Crime he perpetrates, but constantly while he was giving his Evidence against me, was it even in this Court ferocious and malicious ... – an Individual who thro' the whole of his Testimony, was constantly prevaricating, tergiversating, and denying himself – abounding with improbabilities, impossibilities and inconsistencies, who had deposed to the Crime he charged in most material respect at one time before Mr. Jones and Mr. John Knight Greetham, and now when he came before you very differently and in flat contradiction of it.<sup>592</sup>

It is hard to determine how successful he was; while Cruchley and Parsons were acquitted on the charge of sodomy, they were still sentenced to solitary confinement in Marshalsea prison on account of uncleanness, for which the Court Martial Board had signed confessions. Given that many of the convictions for sodomy and sodomitical practices, not only on the *Africaine*, but in previous trials throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> century, depended on both the fear of punishment and the hope of pardon to get confessions and information against others, their attempts to get the confessions thrown out as having been extorted through fear and seduced by hope were doomed to dismissal as “a crotchet.”

## Hope, Fear, and Confessions

Ten years prior to the trials of the crew of the *Africaine*, at Warrington, local justice Mr. Borron reported to Earl Spencer his attempts to use the hope of pardon and the fear of the scaffold to entice Isaac Hitchen and Thomas Rix to give up elite sodomites. Mr. Borron and his fellow magistrate Mr. Gwilym, had already obtained respites for the men, as two of the men already

---

<sup>592</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Cruchley-Parsons Court Martial, 16-19 Jan. 1816).

executed, Holland and Powell, had suggested that Hitchen had names to give, and Rix had persuaded the chaplain that he could give evidence of elite men committing sodomy with him.<sup>593</sup>

Both men ultimately went to the scaffold; Thomas Rix gave a full history of his sexual involvement with other men but insisted that he had never committed the act of sodomy. As well, he admitted he frequently had not known the names of his partners; those he did were usually already dead, and none were men of rank and station.<sup>594</sup> Despite the disappointing nature of his evidence, the chaplain of Lancaster Castle<sup>595</sup> and the local magistrates<sup>596</sup> were convinced he was genuine in his desire to cooperate, and appealed to the Earl Spencer's humanity. Based on advice from the Chief Justice, Lord Ellenborough,<sup>597</sup> Earl Spencer was "reluctantly obliged" to determine that the sentence of the court should stand.<sup>598</sup>

Even though his evidence did not lead to his pardon, Rix's experience was far more in line with the usual employment of hope and fear to gain information about wider sodomitical networks. Isaac Hitchen, however, caused Mr. Borron no end of confusion, as he later related to Earl Spencer.<sup>599</sup> On being told that Powell had told them that he could name names, Hitchen insisted that "Powell had lost his reason thro' fear." When told that, if he told what he knew, he might be allowed to turn King's evidence (thus gaining a pardon and saving his own neck), he insisted that he didn't have any evidence to give them. Hitchen then calmly insisted that he should have been

---

<sup>593</sup> J.A. Borron to Lord Spencer, 8 Sept. 1806, BL Add. MS 75900, vol. dc.

<sup>594</sup> Examination of Thomas Rix, 15 Sept. 1806, BL Add. MS 75900, vol. dc.

<sup>595</sup> Rev. Joseph Rowley to Earl Spencer, 21 Sept. 1806, BL Add. MS 75900, vol. dc.

<sup>596</sup> Mr. Borron to Earl Spencer, 22 Sept. 1806.

<sup>597</sup> Lord Ellenborough to Earl Spencer, 23 Sept. 1806.

<sup>598</sup> Earl Spencer to Rev. Joseph Rowley, 23 Sept. 1806; Earl Spencer to Mr. Borron, 24 Sept. 1806.

<sup>599</sup> Mr. Borron to Earl Spencer, 22 Sept. 1806.

hanged with the rest of the men convicted at Lancaster. The refusal to act upon the hope of a pardon, or evince any fear at the coming punishment, left Mr. Borron reeling with surprise and disquiet. As he told Earl Spencer, “with a man so devoid of feelings of fear, for not one feature of a countenance otherwise intelligent and not one nerve of his frame were moved, what more could be done?”

### Hope, Fear and Sodomy among the Poor.

In September of 1755, Methodist preacher Charles Bradbury was tried at the Old Bailey for sodomy with James Hearne, a 15-year-old Roman Catholic apprentice. Bradbury was acquitted of the crime, seeing as he had in his possession three separate recantations of the charge, which Hearne had signed. At the trial, the prosecution tried to make clear the reason Hearne had signed not one, but three recantations.

I did this because he threatened to hang me, and he had told me my father had threatened to murder me. Then Mr. Bradbury made pretence that I should not lie in the chapel any more. Then I was to go to France; but before I went, they said they had lost that recantation, and I must make another. They bid me keep down in the cellar, fearing my father or master should see me; telling me, that if they saw me, my master would make me serve my time in Bridewell. There they kept me in the cellar in the day time, and made me lie in the chapel at nights.<sup>600</sup>

According to Hearne’s testimony, supported by several of Bradbury’s own parishioners, Bradbury made use of more than just threats to get Hearne to recant – Bradbury’s landlady, Mrs. Pickering, paid a guinea to have the boy brought to France; when he returned, she had him taken from his friends by force, and sent him out of the city.

---

<sup>600</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1755, trial of Charles Bradbury (t17550910-42). The third recantation occurred after Hearne returned from France and repeated his charge against Bradbury.

Fear, whether of violence, or of consequences for misbehaviour, is most often given as the reason men and boys submitted to sexual activity, and as the reason it was not reported immediately after the offence occurred. The men assaulting them were not only physically older and stronger, they were also frequently of higher rank. If multiple people came forward, however, they sometimes had hope of tipping the balance of power towards justice. Edward Woodger, sodomized by Captain Henry Allen of H.M. Sloop *Rattler*, told the court that he didn't report Capt. Allen's behaviour until another complainant came forward because he was afraid that the Captain would "have done me a damage."<sup>601</sup> James Bonny, who confessed what had happened to him to the Ship's Surgeon, Wm. Francis Nye, reported that, not only had he failed to report earlier due to fear of punishment from the Captain, but also that he had sometimes stayed awake all night rather than try to sleep, as ordered, next to the Captain's cot.<sup>602</sup> John Hookey, a Boy under 13 serving on the H.M.S. *Castor*, told the Court Martial Board that he used to frequently try to hide from Solomon Nathan, Ship's Corporal, "for fear he was going to do it again."<sup>603</sup> Hookey also admitted that he didn't come forward to the officers because he was "afraid of getting flogged." Another of the boys accusing Nathan of sodomitical assault, 13-year-old Robert Woodward, attested to threats of physical violence to ensure compliance – Nathan threatened to beat him if he did not come to him, and another boy, Daley, told Woodward that Nathan beat him for the same. Since there was no evidence of emission with any of the four boys who accused him, only of penetration, the Board acquitted Nathan of sodomy, but he was

---

<sup>601</sup> ADM 1/5339 (Court Martial of Henry Allen, 22-24 April 1797). Testimony of Edward Woodger.

<sup>602</sup> ADM 1/5339 (Court Martial of Henry Allen, 22-24 April 1797). Testimony of James Bonny.

<sup>603</sup> ADM 1/5407 (Solomon Nathan Court Martial, 9 July 1810), TNA.



convicted of ‘uncleanness’, and sentenced to receive three hundred lashes, and two years in solitary confinement. He was also deprived of all money owed to him for his naval service.

Multiple witnesses were not always a source of strength, however. The strengthening of the laws against extortion and blackmail mentioned above, often made poorer men reluctant to come forward with accusations of sodomy or sodomitical assault. In Barnwell, now a suburb of Cambridge, in 1823, labourer James Welch was approached by the Rev. Thomas Jephson, a Fellow of St. John’s College. According to Welch, Jephson made lewd comments, and offered Welch money if he would meet him later that night, after dusk. Welch, confused and disgusted by the suggestion, told his friends and family of the situation over their mid-day meal, and arranged to have the others come to this meeting, listen in, and catch Jephson in the act – a similar technique as that used by the agents of the Society for the Reformation of Manners against Captain Rigby in 1698, and to detect many other sodomites in the century in between. Having caught the Rev. Jephson with his trousers undone, the others came out from their hiding places, seized him, and announced their intentions to take him into Cambridge, “as the Bishop was taken to St. James’ Watch-house.”<sup>604</sup> Despite the fact that they were five young men against one older man with his pants down, Rev. Jephson’s position and status in society still gave him a degree of power over them. When they announced their intentions to take him to Mr. Purchas, a magistrate with a house in Cambridge, he drew on his friendship with the magistrate to suggest that, if they did so, they would not be believed. According to prosecutor Joseph Hart, one of the men who discovered the scene, Rev. Jephson told them that he “knew Mr. Purchas well, and if

---

<sup>604</sup> *A Report of the Trial of the Reverend Thomas Jephson*, 8.

we took him there, he would turn us off about our business.”<sup>605</sup> William Buttriss reported Jephson as saying he knew Mr. Purchas “very well.”<sup>606</sup> He then offered them all the money he had with them, and his watch, to let him go. Realizing that accusations against powerful men were not likely to be acted upon, and losing hope of receiving justice in court, they accepted. Joseph Hart had the foresight to refuse to take the money out of Rev. Jephson’s pockets himself, lest he be charged with a robbery. Of course, the next morning, Rev. Jephson went before a magistrate, and made a charge against “persons unknown” for extorting his watch and money under threats of accusing him with an attempt to commit an unnatural crime.

## Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy

Only two years after the raid on Mother Clap’s molly house, the citizens of London once again found themselves forcibly reminded that sodomites walked among them. In April of 1728, noted thief James Dalton, published an account of his life of crime; in it, he described brief forays into the sodomitical underworld. Meeting one evening with Susannah ‘Sukey’ Haws, a prostitute/thief who made his living picking up sodomites, and then demanding money through violence or blackmail, Dalton found himself taken to a molly house run by “Aunt Wittles.”<sup>607</sup> Assuming a man in company with Susannah Hawes must be “one of their beastly and unnatural Community”, they greeted Dalton as a friend. “Lydia Gough”, and “Garter Mary” (a man who

---

<sup>605</sup> *A Report of the Trial of the Reverend Thomas Jephson*, 61.

<sup>606</sup> *A Report of the Trial of the Reverend Thomas Jephson*, 69.

<sup>607</sup> This is quite possibly George Whittle, acquitted of two counts of sodomy in 1726. Whittle was a noted victualler, who ran the Royal Oak in Pall Mall. If he is “Aunt Wittles”, then he moved his house – Dalton lists Aunt Whittles’ molly house as being in Butcher-Row, near Temple Bar. *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1726, trial of George Whytle (t17260420-68); Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative*, 32.

sold garters), complimented Dalton, and “Moll Irons”<sup>608</sup> offered “some sodomitical Civilities”.

Furious at the men for flirting with him, Dalton “took up a Quart Pot, and calling them *a Pack of mollying Sons of B-----s*, swore *he would drive ‘em all to the D---l*; so kicking one, boxing another, and flinging a third behind the Fire.” After threatening to “peg [the] Muns as flat as a Pancake” of any Man who dared to flirt with him, Dalton left the house.

In the fall of that same year, a raid on a molly house in Black Lion Yard, Whitechapel, owned by Jonathan ‘Miss’ Muff,<sup>609</sup> led to the arrest of nine men. These men went on to implicate nearly forty more. During the ensuing trials, several men were convicted of attempted sodomy, and one, John Blake Cowland, was sentenced to death for sodomy with Jonathan Parry.<sup>610</sup> With the memories of the raid on Mother Clap’s still fresh in people’s minds; Dalton’s revelation of the existence of molly houses throughout the city; and now another large raid, moralists and religious writers once more spoke out about the dangers of sodomy. One such pamphlet rails against the many errors of the sodomite – one of which is ingratitude. The author asks

Is this the Return of Gratitude to the Fair-Sex for giving thee Birth? Hast thou never heard of the racking Torments, and lingering Miseries, and very often that throbbing Pangs of Death seize them, to give thee a Being in order for external Happiness? Is this the Reward thou givest to thy tender Nurse for giving thee her warm Breast to nourish thee? Is this thy Reward to the Female at thy Baptism, that prest thee with a thousand Kisses, and ten

---

<sup>608</sup> I have not been able to trace either Lydia Gough or Garter Mary, but Moll Irons could be John Irons, convicted of sodomitical practises with William Coleman. *Parker’s Penny Post*, 21 Oct. 1726, states that he was known among the Sodomites by the name of ‘Queen Irons’, which is very similar. However, Dalton also lists a Queen Irons (alias Pippin Mary) in his list of men frequenting Sukey Bevell’s house in the Mint (40.), so they may have been two different people.

<sup>609</sup> *Fog’s Weekly Journal*, 5 Oct. 1728. While ‘Miss Muff’ is explicitly listed as one of the ‘7 or 8’ men sent to prison charged with sodomitical practices, I can find no record of the results of a trial, or if one even occurred. Muff’s molly house comes up in several trials at the Old Bailey related to this raid – those of John Bleak Cowland (t17281016-16), Richard Challoner (t17281016-62), and Isaac Milton (17281016-72).

<sup>610</sup> This was later respited during pleasure. Cf. *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, October 1728, trial of John Bleak Cowland (t17281016-16); SP 36/12 f.177; SP 36/13 f.129.

thousand kind Wishes, hoping some Female might be the better for thee? Cou'd they have suppos'd the Favour would be return'd backward ... to forsake that charming, sweet, delightful, heavenly Creature, that breeds thy own Likeness, to go to that unnatural Dunghill, sowing thy Seed for a Breed of Cockatrices, Snakes or Devils, if it shou'd take Root.<sup>611</sup>

According to this logic, by spurning sex (and marriage) to women, the sodomite was guilty of ingratitude to the woman that bore him, raised him, and hoped for his future.

## Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy in Elite Circles

William Beckford met the youth who would become his dearest friend and most faithful companion, on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May 1787, at the Patriarchal Seminary and College of Music in Lisbon.<sup>612</sup> The future Chevalier Gregorio Felipe Franchi (a title Beckford secured for him in 1799)<sup>613</sup>, was then 17 (Beckford was ten years older); after hearing Franchi playing Haydn on the harpsichord, Beckford took the boy on as a companion, a “sweet-breathed animal to enliven [his] spirits, to run into the citron thickets and bring ... flowery branches...”<sup>614</sup> A year later, Franchi's father, Neapolitan musician Loreto Franchi, sent Gregorio to Beckford in Madrid, with a letter committing him to Beckford's service and care. Franchi was devoted to Beckford for the rest of his life.

That Beckford returned to England with a handsome, young man in his service, as well as a Catholic priest and a French dwarf, did not fail to stir up rumours regarding Beckford's sexuality

---

<sup>611</sup> Anonymous, *A Treatise, Wherein Are Strict Observations upon That Detestable and Most Shocking Sin of Sodomy, Blasphemy, and Atheism*. (London: Printed for A. Moore, 1728), 31–32.

<sup>612</sup> Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 28.

<sup>613</sup> Beckford, 29.

<sup>614</sup> William Beckford, *The Journal of William Beckford in Portugal and Spain, 1787-1788*, ed. Boyd Alexander (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954), 208.

once again. One such incident occurred in 1807, not long after Beckford settled down at Fonthill Abbey, in Wiltshire. Unwilling (due to local patronage) to criticize Beckford himself, locals quickly selected Franchi as the target of malicious gossip. John Still (1761-1839), Prebendary of Salisbury, Rector of Fonthill Gifford and Chickdale, and brother to James Still (land-steward to both Beckford and his cousin Peter, nicknamed ‘The Great Dolt’), was one such gossip; shortly after Franchi went to London on an errand in December 1807, Rev. Still launched “a most fervid renewal ... of all the well-known attacks” on Franchi.<sup>615</sup> As Beckford observed to Franchi, it was “impossible to picture the extreme rage” which filled his heart.<sup>616</sup> Unable to get at the Rev. Still, Beckford took out his rage on ‘the Great Dolt’ – “he all but died from the effects of being shrivelled up by me.”<sup>617</sup>

Franchi was not particularly concerned by the gossip, and preferred that Beckford ignore the whole affair; Beckford began to resent the fact that Franchi did not appreciate his furious support. Less than a fortnight after the Rev. Still began his ‘attacks’ on Franchi’s honour, Beckford complained to Franchi that he did

not deserve ... complaints and murmurings at a time when my life is being disturbed, torn to shreds and shortened (most probably) *all in your defence*. ... Your letter of yesterday is the most ill-conceived, the most ill-reasoned and the most confused you have ever in your life written to me. You haven’t understood me – a fine confusion indeed, a pleasant reward for one who is consumed with anxiety to avenge and protect you!<sup>618</sup>

---

<sup>615</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 10 Dec. 1807, printed in Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 57.

<sup>616</sup> Beckford, 58.

<sup>617</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 15 Dec. 1807, printed in Beckford, 59.

<sup>618</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 19 Dec. 1807; printed in Beckford, 62.

Beckford's defence of Franchi from accusations of sodomitical proclivities, as well as his expectation of gratitude for that defence, highlights some of the ways in which gratitude and anger could be used by elite sodomites both as means of protection and to embed their relationships within social structures based on patronage.

### Gratitude as Enticement and Appeasement.

Elite sodomites could use their influence and wealth to offer either protection or rewards to potential sexual partners. As was shown in the section above, the potential of gaining the elite man's gratitude was often offered as a source of hope and enticement, either to encourage poorer men and boys to engage in activities with them, or to let them escape when those activities were rebuffed. Capt. Rigby promised William Minton in 1698 that, if Minton let him go, he would "doe good to you or to anybody"<sup>619</sup>; and Capt. Henry Angel of the *Stag* hinted to passenger Rice Price that he could get him a position as Ship's Carpenter, shortly after attempting to seduce Price in his Cabin.<sup>620</sup> Francis Henry Hay, the 12-year-old partner of Lt. Robert Jones, told the court at the Old Bailey that, after the first time, he continued to engage in sodomitical relations with Jones, in order to secure Jones' custom for his uncle's business.<sup>621</sup>

Indeed, it grew to be a popular expectation that elite sodomites would draw on the sense of gratitude for kindnesses granted to servants. According to the testimony of coachman John Sangster, who charged noted actor Samuel Foote with attempting to commit sodomy with him,

---

<sup>619</sup> MJ/SP/1698/12/024 (Information of William Minton, 4 Nov. 1698), LMA.

<sup>620</sup> ADM 1/5301 (Court Martial of Capt. Henry Angel, 12 January 1762), TNA.

<sup>621</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1772, trial of ROBERT JONES (t17720715-22).

Foote drew upon Sangster's gratitude for the help and medicine Foote gave him during a bout with the measles, stating explicitly that "the best recompence you can make is to let me have a fuck at you."<sup>622</sup> The scenario that Sangster reported was quite believable; however, Sangster made a mistake – he reported that the attempt occurred on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, when Foote came into town to meet with his players. Foote was able to show that he had not in fact gone into town that day and argued that Sangster had been dismissed for being drunk. According to the account of the trial in *Lloyd's Evening Post*, Lord Mansfield observed that, in this case, "The Providence of God interposes for the Prosecutor to fix on such a day as Mr. Foote did not go to town, though he had done it many years back, and in such cases it can only be by providential means, or the Prosecutor's contradicting himself in evidence, that the innocent escape the ruin of their reputation and welfare."<sup>623</sup> Sangster's testimony itself was completely believable and consistent; were it not for his mistaking the day, Foote might well have been convicted of the crime. As it was, Sangster's story was believable enough that Foote's reputation never recovered – he sold his shares in the theatre - and went into retirement in Brighton; he was on his way to France on his physician's advice when he caught a chill and died at Dover. His death was perceived as the truth of Sangster's charge. Hester Thrale Piozzi, writing in the margins of a letter from Dr. Johnson, commented that "Doctor Johnson was not aware that Foote broke his heart because of a hideous detection; he was trying to run away from England, and from infamy, but death stopped him."<sup>624</sup>

---

<sup>622</sup> James Oldham, *The Mansfield Manuscripts and the Growth of English Law in the 18th Century*, vol. 2 (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1992), 1004.

<sup>623</sup> *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 9-11 Dec 1776.

<sup>624</sup> Hester Lynch Salusbury Thrale Piozzi, *Autobiography, Letters and Literary Remains of Mrs. Piozzi (Thrale)*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1861), 77.

## 'Fired with that Honest Rage': Anger as a Response to Accusations of Sodomy.

John, Lord Hervey had returned to England in September 1729, after his eighteen-month stay in Italy with Stephen Fox, only to find himself in the center of a power-contest between Robert Walpole and Pulteney. Eventually, Hervey sided with Walpole, and was believed to have published an anonymous pamphlet in early 1731, attacking Pulteney and Bolingbroke. In response, another pamphlet, attributed to Pulteney,<sup>625</sup> attacked Hervey as a “delicate hermaphrodite”, a “master-miss”<sup>626</sup> and reminded him that accusations of corruption, like sodomy, were equally punishable in both the agent and the passive.<sup>627</sup> This pamphlet included satirical depictions of Hervey’s sexuality and gender identity that Pope would use with such brutal wit in his character of Sporus.<sup>628</sup> Hervey felt compelled to avenge this public insult, which implicated not only Hervey himself, but rendered suspect his close relationships with Stephen Fox and Frederick, Prince of Wales.<sup>629</sup> Consequently, Hervey challenged Pulteney to a duel, one he was not certain he would win. According to biographer Robert Halsband, Hervey told Pulteney that he had a letter in his pocket for the King, stating that the duel was his idea, and asking for his protection of Pulteney should he be killed as a result of the duel.<sup>630</sup> Hervey was

---

<sup>625</sup> The pamphlet itself claims to be written by Caleb D’Anvers, the pseudonymous author of the newspaper *The Craftsman*; but it is broadly accepted as having been written by Pulteney.

<sup>626</sup> Caleb D’Anvers, *A Proper Reply to a Late Scurrilous Libel Intituled Sedition and Defamation Display’d* (London: Printed for R. Francklin, 1731), 6.

<sup>627</sup> D’Anvers, 27.

<sup>628</sup> “Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot, Being the Prologue to the Satires [1735],” in *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq.*, vol. 2 (London: Printed for A. Millar, J. and R. Tonson, H. Lintot and C. Bathurst, 1764), 157. William Coxe, in his *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Robert Walpole*, comments that, in this poem, Pope has “armed his muse with a scalping knife.” *Memoirs Of The Life And Administration Of Sir Robert Walpole, Earl Of Orford: With Original Correspondence And Authentic Papers, Never Before Published.*, vol. 1 (London: Cadell and Davies, 1798), 362n.

<sup>629</sup> Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 111.

<sup>630</sup> Halsband, 114.



wounded in the hand and the side; the seconds then interfered, and, on Pulteney's part at least, ended the matter.<sup>631</sup> At St. James', Hervey gained the most from the duel; as Lady Irwin told her father, Lord Carlisle "... I fancy upon the whole [the duel] will turn to Lord Hervey's service, he knowing well how to make a merit of this at the Court; and besides, most people had the same opinion of Lord Hervey before Mr. Polteney drew his character with so much wit; but nobody before this adventure thought he had the courage to send a challenge."<sup>632</sup> In the long term, Pulteney took the most lasting victory; Hervey would forever be remembered as a "delicate Hermaphrodite", as "Sporus"; and people, as his friend and rival Lady Mary Wortley Montagu would quip, could forever be divided into "men, women, and Herveys."<sup>633</sup>

Hervey's reaction was understood as a natural response to protect his honour. As duelling, which had been invented as a formal channel for anger, one with limited consequences compared to the dynastic feuding of the middle ages, became increasingly discouraged over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the courtroom became the preferred arena to deal with the 'natural' anger resulting from an accusation, or even insinuation, of sodomy. Two years after the trial of Samuel Foote, mentioned above, a man named Goodchild, formerly a clerk to Justice Gretton,<sup>634</sup> was convicted (with two others) of extorting £20 and one guinea from George Medley, Esq., M.P. for Seaford

---

<sup>631</sup> Coxe states that Hervey's "cool and manly conduct in the duel ... proved neither want of spirit to resent an injury, or deficiency of courage ... and he compelled his adversary to respect his conduct, though he had satirized his person." Coxe, *Memoirs Of The Life And Administration Of Sir Robert Walpole, Earl Of Orford*, 1:363n.

<sup>632</sup> Lady Irwin to Lord Carlisle, cited in Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 115.

<sup>633</sup> Horace Walpole, *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, Digital Collection, vol. 17 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1937), 274 n.31. Horace Walpole, describing Hervey's daughter, claimed that she is as 'masculine as her father should be.'

<sup>634</sup> John Gretton was superseded from the Middlesex Bench in March 1778, one of twelve justices removed from the Middlesex Bench between 1716 and 1792 for engaging in illegal activities. Cf. Norma Landau, "The Trading Justice's Trade," in *Law, Crime and English Society, 1660–1830*, ed. Norma Landau (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 48–49.

in Sussex. According to Mr. Medley, Goodchild came to his house in May of 1778; when admitted, Goodchild held a warrant in his hand, a pen behind his ear, and, claiming to be a clerk to Justice Goodchild, Linen Draper, told Medley that he had come to inform him that two men had applied to Justice Goodchild (his cousin) for a warrant charging him with sodomy. Goodchild, out of friendship for Mr. Medley, had come to warn him, so that he could prepare to defend himself against the heinous charge. Medley was furious: “fired with that honest rage and indignation which naturally inspires men of fair character and resolution, [he] demanded in great anger to know his accusers, to be instantly carried before a magistrate, where he might confront the authors of so diabolical a charge.”<sup>635</sup> Goodchild attempted to dampen Medley’s anger with fear, reminding him of the odium and disgrace that such a public charge would do to him and to his family, even if Medley were acquitted. Goodchild advised Medley, out of the goodness of his heart, to meet with the men, and bribe them to remain silent. This Mr. Medley did and gave the two men a draft on his banker for £20; Goodchild asked Mr. Medley to remember him for his friendly services, for which he was given a guinea, and the three men went away. Robert Hutton (one of the men accusing Medley) was arrested the next day, for extorting money from George Hadley by threatening to accuse him of sodomy,<sup>636</sup> and, based on Medley’s description, Goodchild was arrested the next day, visiting Hutton in prison. Goodchild was sentenced to three years’ imprisonment, and to stand in the pillory three times, once each year of his imprisonment.<sup>637</sup> Mr. Medley’s anger is presented as the only possible reaction of a good and

---

<sup>635</sup> *St. James Chronicle*, 14 July 1778.

<sup>636</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, June 1778, trial of ROBERT HARROLD, otherwise HUTTON, otherwise SUTTON, otherwise JACKSON (t17780603-63).

<sup>637</sup> *General Evening Post*, 11-14 July 1778.

honourable man to the suggestion that he could be involved with sodomy or sodomites in any fashion.

Not all men turned to the law, however; some took justice into their own hands. Violence committed as a result of anger at being accused of sodomitical practices was often considered to be completely justified. On September 4<sup>th</sup>, 1800, when returning to H.M. Bomb Vessel *Vulcan* from dinner ashore at Trincomalee, Captain Peter Heywood<sup>638</sup> and one of his officers, Lt. Dickie, were met by Mr. Munday, the ship's carpenter. Mr. Munday was quite drunk; he called the officers rascals, and then struck them repeatedly. Such an offence should have the offender being clapped in irons, and eventually tried and punished; Mr. Munday, however, complicated his offence by singing out repeatedly the following couplet, loudly and in Lt. Dickie's hearing:

Little Dickie, Little Dickie  
Damn and Bugger Little Dickie.<sup>639</sup>

Incensed that Munday was calling him a bugger (and calling into question the size of his manhood), Dickie immediately dove into action. Drawing his dirk, he stabbed the inebriated carpenter to death. Lt. Dickie was eventually brought before a court martial (though it took nearly a year for enough ships to be gathered) to answer for the murder. The Court Martial Board agreed that he had acted under extreme provocation; that Munday had called him a bugger was

---

<sup>638</sup> Peter Heywood, having been pardoned of his role in the mutiny aboard the H.M.S. *Bounty*, had only just been appointed to command of the *Vulcan*, a rickety and unsafe 10-gun vessel (sold 1802, cf. Peter A. Ward, *British Naval Power in the East, 1794-1805: The Command of Admiral Peter Rainier* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2013), 186.)), the month before. Heywood would remain in command of the *Vulcan* until June 1801, when he was reassigned to the *Trincomalee* Sloop. Cf. Edward Tagart and Peter Heywood, *A Memoir of the Late Captain Peter Heywood, R.N. with Extracts from His Diaries and Correspondence*. (London: Effingham Wilson, 1832), 170–73.

<sup>639</sup> ADM 12/24 (Dickie Court Martial, 13 August 1801), 271-2.

determined to be enough to acquit him of the charge of murder. However, he was chastised for not following established procedure for dealing with drunken, violent crewmen – Dickie was cashiered and forbidden ever to serve as an officer again.<sup>640</sup>

Given how rumour, gossip and insinuation had ruined William Beckford's life, it is perhaps unsurprising that he was so quick to jump to the defence of his friend and servant Franchi when he was rumoured to be a sodomite. Given that Franchi was at that time operating on instructions from Beckford to attempt to seduce young Matthew Saunders, the tight-rope walker, on Beckford's behalf, his anger could also have been in part caused by fear – for himself, and for his friend. While Franchi was justly annoyed at Beckford making a large issue out of rumour and gossip, Beckford's feeling hurt at Franchi's 'ingratitude' is understandable – Beckford knew well that rumour and gossip could destroy a man's life.

### Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

The clergymen and reformers who made up the primary membership of the SRMs did so in order to forestall the wrath of God which otherwise was destined to fall upon England. As Harry Cocks observes, "the idea that England, having been delivered from the popery of James II by the Glorious Revolution of 1688, was now testing God's patience with its sins and iniquities, was a pervasive one."<sup>641</sup> According to botanist and clergyman John Ray, writing in 1692,

...there are certain times when Iniquity doth abound, and Wickedness overflow in a Nation or City; and that long Peace and Prosperity, and great Riches, are apt to create Pride and Luxury, and introduce a general Corruption of Manners: And that at such times God

---

<sup>640</sup> ADM 12/24 (Dickie Court Martial, 12 Aug. 1801), 272.

<sup>641</sup> Cocks, *Visions of Sodom*, 74.

usually sends some sweeping Judgment, either utterly destroying such a People who have filled up the measure of their iniquity, or at least grievously afflicts and diminishes them.<sup>642</sup>

Rev. Edward Fowler, one of the founders of the SRM, wrote that same year of the danger that they were in, should urban sin remain uncurbed, not only the sinners themselves be subject to God's wrath, but all those who allow it to continue unchecked.<sup>643</sup> Unlike many of the grass-roots Protestant religious societies which had grown up in London in the 1680s, and from which much of the membership of the SRM was drawn, the SRM was tied to the Glorious Revolution and the survival of the Protestant religion. The work of reformation, then, was essential not only to avert the God's anger, but to show appropriate gratitude for God's helping secure England's deliverance from the popery and tyranny of James II.<sup>644</sup>

Even after the SRM had shut down, the idea that permitting the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah to flourish in England would bring down God's wrath and destruction persisted, chiefly among religious writers, but also spread into the broader culture. In 1756, Rev. Dr. Allen preached a sermon on the destruction of the Biblical city of Sodom, as a warning to his congregation to reform their behaviour, as God's anger falls not only on the sinners themselves, but on those who allow sin to persist in their midst. "When ... obstinacy and contempt of God is general, we know what he may do, by what he did by Sodom and Gomorrah; and such things wicked cities and

---

<sup>642</sup> John Ray, *Three Physico-Theological Discourses, Concerning the Primitive Chaos, and Creation of the World* [1692], The Third Edition, Illustrated with Copper-Plates, and much more enlarged than the former Editions, from the Author's own MSS. (London: Printed for William Innys, At the Prince's Arms in S. Paul's Church-yard, 1713), 270.

<sup>643</sup> Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of a Late Undertaking of Certain Gentlemen, in Order to the Suppressing of Debauchery and Profaneness*. (London, 1692), 21.

<sup>644</sup> Cocks, *Visions of Sodom*, 77–78.

nations have reason to look for every day.”<sup>645</sup> Others, such as John Wesley, tied to Sodom the destruction of other ‘sinful’ cities; such as the earthquakes in Port Royal, Jamaica in 1692, and in Lisbon in 1755<sup>646</sup>, which killed an estimated 60,000 people in that city alone.<sup>647</sup> The aftershocks of the Lisbon earthquake were felt across Europe, and even as far as Morocco; for John Wesley, they were a sign that God was not less displeased with Great Britain than with Portugal. “... although the Earth does not yet open in *England* or *Ireland*, has it not shook, and reeled to and fro like a drunken Man? And that not in one or two Places only, but almost from one End of the Kingdom to the other.”<sup>648</sup> Should people dismiss the significance of the earthquakes and other natural disasters, Wesley also reminded them of the projected return of Haley’s comet in 1758 – what if it should hit the earth?

... what if this vast Body is already on its Way? If it is nearer than we are aware of? ... Probably it will be seen first, drawing nearer and nearer, ‘till it appears as another Moon in Magnitude, though not in Colour, being of a deep fiery Red: Then scorching and burning up all the Produce of the Earth, driving away all Clouds, and so cutting off the Hope or Possibility of any Rain or Dew; drying up every Fountain, Stream, and River; causing all Faces to gather Blackness, and all Men’s Hearts to fail. Then executing its grand Commission on the Globe itself, and causing the Stars to fall from Heaven.”<sup>649</sup>

Only by showing true faith and reformation, true gratitude for God’s mercy could the anger of God be appeased.

---

<sup>645</sup> John Allen, *The Destruction of Sodom Improved, as a Warning to Great-Britain. A Sermon Preached on the Fast-Day, Friday February 6, 1756, at Honover-Street, Long-Acre.* (London: Printed for A. Millar, 1756), 22–23.

<sup>646</sup> John Wesley, *Serious Thoughts Occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon. To Which Is Subjoin’d An Account of All the Late Earthquakes There, and in Other Places.*, The Sixth Edition (London: Printed in the Year MDCCLVI, 1756), 4.

<sup>647</sup> *Britannica Academic*, s.v. "Lisbon earthquake of 1755," accessed June 19, 2019, <https://academic-eb-com.proxy1.lib.uwo.ca/levels/collegiate/article/Lisbon-earthquake-of-1755/438086>.

<sup>648</sup> Wesley, *Serious Thoughts Occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon*, 5.

<sup>649</sup> Wesley, 15–16.

While many of the religious writers refer to sodomy only by allusion, and instead dwell on the overall pride, luxury, idleness and lack of charity as being the primary sins of the people of Sodom, others used the discovery and execution of particular sodomites to draw explicit connections between the act of sodomy and the destruction of the ancient cities. James Gutherie, the Ordinary of Newgate in 1726, spent much time reminding Gabriel Lawrence, William Griffin and Thomas Wright, that their actions had doomed not only themselves, but possibly the entire country. He “insisted upon the Villany and uncleanness of unnatural Sins, which ought not to be nam’d among ... Christians who profess the true Religion ... I show’d ‘em the Evil of this Sin from God’s visible Judgments inflicted on Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbouring Cities, in raining Fire and Brimstone from Heaven upon them, and consuming them as in a Moment.”<sup>650</sup> Newspapers reporting on the detection of these men and others at Mother Clap’s molly house were also quick to make that connection. The *Ipswich Journal* observed that, since the Government had “undertaken the prosecution of [the sodomites], ‘tis not doubted, but strict Care will be taken to detect them in order to avert from these Cities those just Judgments, which fell from Heaven upon Sodom and Gomorrah.”<sup>651</sup> Reprinting a letter from a London paper, the *Caledonian Mercury* heaped praise on the SRM, and declared that “any that wish well to their dear Country, refuse Assistance for detecting and punishing these Miscreants? Were it not for a small Remnant, we might fear, that as we are in *Sin*, so we should soon be in *Punishment*, like unto Sodom and Gomorrah.”<sup>652</sup>

---

<sup>650</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate’s Account, May 1726 (OA17260509).

<sup>651</sup> *Ipswich Journal*, 30 April 1726.

<sup>652</sup> *Caledonian Mercury*, 23 May 1726.

Similar arguments were made by numerous middling sort contributors to newspapers when notable sodomites, such as Robert Jones, were pardoned, or they felt that too few sodomites were being caught and punished. The *Bath Chronicle* reminded its readers that, of all the sins and offences against God and man, proof of the wickedness of the ancient Jews contained in the Bible could be expressed in a single phrase, *That there were Sodomites in the land*.<sup>653</sup> In a letter to the king, submitted to the *Morning Chronicle* by contributor 'Philo-Misericordia',

...by reprieving this man a Prince incurs the displeasure of that omnipotent Being who requires blood for blood; and that at the great tribunal he stands accused by the law of God, to answer for the crimes of those he has unjustly suffered to exist, when such pests to mankind ought to be annihilated from the race of man, and every individual roused at the great call of nature, to lend his aid toward the destruction of such wretches, and not let this great, opulent and commercial city suffer the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah.<sup>654</sup>

In *Bingley's Journal*, contributor 'Subject' reminded the King that in 1750, the King of France proved himself (in that at least) worthy of the title of "Most Christian" King, when he burnt two men alive at Paris for sodomy, and closes with a prayer to God "to avert the judgments, which I fear hang over this your kingdom, and to inspire your Majesty with sentiments worthy of a "Christian" Prince."<sup>655</sup>

## Gratitude, Anger, and Sodomy: The Poor.

Newspaper accounts of popular rage and violence against sodomites seldom identify particular groups of people: they become the formless, shapeless, 'mob', who act as justice's self-appointed

---

<sup>653</sup> *Bath Chronicle*, 13 Aug. 1772. This is an allusion to KJV 1 Kings 14:24: "And there were also sodomites in the land: and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the LORD cast out before the children of Israel."

<sup>654</sup> Philo-Misericordia, "To the \*\*\*\*", *Morning Chronicle*, 19 August 1772.

<sup>655</sup> Subject, "To the King", *Bingley's Journal*, 17 October 1772.



blunt instruments. The Crowd has long been a staple of social history. Studies of the crowd in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries tended to be extremely negative, seeing the crowd as a “psychological phenomenon, symptomatic of a broader social malaise in industrial society characterised by rootlessness, want, and anomie, and prone to atavistic brutality, fanaticism, and frenzied intolerance.”<sup>656</sup> In the 1930s, Georges Lefebvre challenged this view of the crowd; in his view, crowds were “cultural phenomena whose form and outlook were shaped by everyday habits and associations.”<sup>657</sup> Following the Second World War, Marxist historians began to focus on riots, rebellions, and other popular revolutionary activities. Critical to the study of the crowd in 18<sup>th</sup> century Britain was George Rudé. His work, particularly *The Crowd in History*, analyzes the impact and importance of various uprisings in France and Britain between 1730 and 1848. Instead of being an unthinking, reactionary herd, Rudé’s crowd act with courage and vision, trying to change the injustices of their society.<sup>658</sup> Since the 1960s and 70s, however, social historians have come to see the crowd as the means for the poor to enforce what E.P. Thompson has termed the “moral economy”.<sup>659</sup> Thompson sees in the 18<sup>th</sup>-century English riot a legitimizing notion: the widespread “belief that they were defending traditional rights or customs.”<sup>660</sup> To this, Nicholas Rogers adds the important qualification that the crowd was not

---

<sup>656</sup> Nicholas Rogers, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 3.

<sup>657</sup> Rogers, 5.

<sup>658</sup> George F. E. Rudé, *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848*, Rev. Edition (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1981).

<sup>659</sup> E. P. Thompson, “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century,” *Past & Present* 50 (1971): 76–136.

<sup>660</sup> Thompson, 78. Thompson later expanded this concept to many types of popular action. Cf. Thompson, *Customs in Common*.

uniquely made up of the poor, but could contain or be shaped by elites and middling sorts.<sup>661</sup> In public houses, on the streets, and at the pillory, the crowd acted in support of ‘traditional’ values and customs through its violent expressions of hatred and anger towards sodomites.

### Patronage, Gratitude, and the Poor.

Patronage, and the gratitude that it could cause, while it could be used to stop poor men from reporting seduction attempts, or put pressure on them to accept such attempts, could also cause the poor in communities to disregard sodomitical behaviour in their social superiors. William Benbow claimed that William Courtenay was “so humane and charitable that to this day all the poor in the neighbourhood of Exeter lament his absence.”<sup>662</sup> His English tenants at Powderham Castle insisted that his body be brought back from Paris after his death in 1835. As James Donnelly Jr. points out, this feeling was not shared by the tenants of Courtenay’s Irish estates, where his agent Alexander Hoskins’ harsh and violent methods of extracting the rent “threw the Courtenay estate and adjoining parts of west Limerick into a frenzy of disorder and violence.”<sup>663</sup>

After William Beckford was forced to sell his estate in Wiltshire, his departure was greatly felt by the country folk. Thirty-six years later, a visitor to the region found that “his name still lives in Wiltshire ... as a solitary severe man who lived for himself, yet was kind, generous, and a

---

<sup>661</sup> Rogers, *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain*.

<sup>662</sup> William Benbow, “The Crimes of the Clergy, Or The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken. Character and Crimes of the Rev. John Fenwick, B.A. And Formerly Vicker of Byall, in the County of Northumberland, Who Absconded for the Crime of Sodomy, in the Year 1797, and Now Resides at Naples [1823],” in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850*, ed. Ian McCormick, vol. 2: Sodomy (London: Routledge, 2000), 230.

<sup>663</sup> James S. Donnelly Jr., *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821–1824* (Madison: Univ of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 367 n7, 338.

great employer of the poor.”<sup>664</sup> This same visitor, who was preparing to review Cyrus Redding’s *Memoirs of William Beckford of Fonthill*, interviewed one of Beckford’s old keepers, who told him many fond stories of Beckford’s kindness and charity, including one terrible winter where he had roads cut in the woods for the use of the poor. As with Courtenay’s Irish estates, one must question whether the slaves on Beckford’s Jamaican estates would share the gratitude to Beckford held by the poor labourers of Wiltshire.

### “She Would Sooner be Bate by Him Every Hour”: Poor Women, Sodomy, and Anger

In one of the earliest broadsides, *The Woman-Hater’s Lamentation*, published in 1707, the mass arrest of sodomites (which led to three suicides) is portrayed as God’s justice for the women they have wronged.

Ye injur'd Females see  
Justice without the Laws,  
Seeing the Injury,  
Has thus reveng'd your Cause. ...

This piece of Justice then  
Has well reveng'd their Cause,  
And shews unnat'ral Lust  
Is curs'd without the Laws.<sup>665</sup>

Another ballad, written for the pillorying of another man (probably Thomas Dalton) in 1726, explores similar themes.

When to the Pillory he came,

---

<sup>664</sup> *Athenaeum*, 11 Dec. 1858, 749.

<sup>665</sup> Trumbach, “The Woman-Hater’s Lamentation: Or A New Copy of Verses on the Fatal End of Mr. Grant, a Woollen-Draper, and Two Others That Cut Their Throats or Hang’d Themselves in the Counter; with the Discovery of near Hundred More That Are Accused for Unnatural Dispising of the Fair Sex, and Intriguing with One Another [1707].”

The Women gather'd all for Game  
 To see his Face;  
 With Eggs apace,  
 Of rotten Race,  
 They make him rue.

The Women down his Breeches took,  
 And underneath some gave a Look;  
 And those by Mars,  
 Did whip his A--e  
 For all his Stars,  
 Ev'n in the Street.<sup>666</sup>

According to Francis Place in 1829, reflecting on his experiences of the pillory over the previous two decades, constables at Charing Cross “permitted a number of women to pass between them, in the open space around the pillory.” It was only they, as the moral agents of the community, who could pelt the offender.<sup>667</sup> Bartlett, citing Frank McGlynn, argues that this was done as a way to limit the violence of the crowd.<sup>668</sup> In newspaper accounts of the pillorying of sodomites, the fact that the women are up front serves to present women, particularly poor women, as the parties most wounded by sodomy. Newspapers emphasized the role of poor women in punishing sodomites at pillories. Often described as Amazons, newspapers depict them as being particularly angry with and violent towards men convicted of sodomitical practices. For example, when a tailor named Devonish (aged 60) was pilloried in late May 1739, an Amazon jumped on

---

<sup>666</sup> David F. Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 35–36. Also cited in Peter Bartlett, “Sodomites in the Pillory in Eighteenth-Century London,” *Social & Legal Studies* 6, no. 4 (December 1, 1997): 560–61.

<sup>667</sup> Add. MSS 27826 ff.174, BL. Cited in Robert Shoemaker, *The London Mob: Violence and Disorder in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Hambledon and London, 2004), 105.

<sup>668</sup> Bartlett, “Sodomites in the Pillory in Eighteenth-Century London,” 560. He cites Frank McGlynn, *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1989), 283. McGlynn cites the same passage from the diary of Francis Place, but phrases it as a suggestion Place is making in the wake of the death of William Smith in 1780.

him, pulled down his breeches, and whipped his buttocks until the blood ran.<sup>669</sup> This was also the fate of an unknown sodomite pilloried at the Royal Exchange in 1742; as with Devonish, an ‘Amazon’ ripped off his breeches and beat his buttocks with rods.<sup>670</sup> A barber named Bourke tried to avoid the zealousness of the women at Fleet Street in 1760, by cleverly wearing two sets of breeches. The women merely ripped both pairs from his body, and, to add insult to injury, dipped them in the Kennel, and used them to whip him soundly.<sup>671</sup> In 1763, a contributor to the *Gazetteer* observed that he could identify when a man was being pilloried for sodomitical practices by the size and anger of the mob, particularly the women.<sup>672</sup> Some of the newspaper accounts of the pillorying of the Vere Street Coterie make special mention that the women were granted a special place close to the pillory.<sup>673</sup>

Poor women play an important role in this narrative: as middling and elite women were expected (out of modesty) to avoid any discussion or knowledge of sodomy, the active role of poor women in punishing sodomites was increasingly emphasized; at the pillorying of the men arrested at the Swan in Vere-street, the *Morning Post* makes special mention of poor women. They highlight the actions of a group of fish-women, who spent several days preparing for the

---

<sup>669</sup> *Common Sense (Englishman's Journal)*, 2 June 1739; *Country Journal (Craftsman)*, 2 June 1739; *Read's Weekly Journal (British Gazeteer)*, 2 June 1739; *London and Country Journal*, 5 June 1739.

<sup>670</sup> *Norwich Gazette*, 13-20 March 1742; *Common Sense (Englishman's Journal)*, 20 March 1742.

<sup>671</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post (London Intelligencer)*, 22-24 July 1760.

<sup>672</sup> *Gazetteer (London Daily Advertiser)*, 1 July 1763. He goes on to describe the horrible fate experienced by the man and suggests that drowning men convicted of sodomitical practices might be more merciful than putting them in the pillory.

<sup>673</sup> *Morning Advertiser*, 28 Sept. 1810. A detailed discussion of this can be found in Gilbert, “Sexual Deviance and Disaster During the Napoleonic Wars,” 107.

pillory. They set aside “stinking flounders and the entrails of other fish,” which the women refused to sell, instead putting them aside “for their own use.”<sup>674</sup>

Bartlett sees this emphasis on the role of women in the pillorying of sodomites as part of the gendered understanding of sodomy in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. Since they are wronged (because sodomites have insulted them by turning to other men for sex), it is only appropriate that they should be heavily involved in the extraction of public vengeance.<sup>675</sup> Women were active in other forms of 18<sup>th</sup> century rioting, and so may have been particularly active at the pillory.<sup>676</sup> However, as Bartlett points out, this image is one that is purposefully cultivated by the men who write these accounts, and may not necessarily reflect the opinions of the women themselves.<sup>677</sup>

In describing the violence at the pillory against sodomites, the newspaper writers are making a point about the danger and unpredictability of the poor. A few weeks before the pillorying of the men of the Swan, the *Public Ledger* related an “amusing” anecdote about the reception faced by George Rowell, one of the men arrested at the Swan, when he was first committed to prison.

The Prisoner was locked up with an Irishman, who was in custody for beating his wife. Pat remonstrated to the jailor against being confined with such a character, but not succeeding in getting removed, ... he threatened the monster with vengeance if he offered to touch him. Scores of women got in the back way, and some disturbance having been heard, an officer went to investigate the cause, when Murphy was seen exhibiting the fact of the fellow to the female vixens, who assailed him ... but Pat insisted that he should not be scratched, as Mr. Ketch would deal with him in time. While the officers were clearing the

---

<sup>674</sup> *Morning Post*, 28 Sept. 1810.

<sup>675</sup> Bartlett, “Sodomites in the Pillory in Eighteenth-Century London,” 562.

<sup>676</sup> Thompson, “Moral Economy”; John Bohstedt, “Gender, Household, and Community Politics: Women in English Riots 1790-1810,” *Past & Present* 120, no. 1 (August 1, 1988): 88–122.

<sup>677</sup> Bartlett, “Sodomites in the Pillory in Eighteenth-Century London,” 562.

place, the Irishman's wife appeared, and demanded his liberation, as she would sooner be bate by him every hour, than he or his family should be so disgraced.<sup>678</sup>

This story combines anger at the very presence of a sodomite, with classist and xenophobic descriptions of the poor Irish; the Irishman's wife chooses to have her husband come home and beat her than have him share a cell with a sodomite.

### 'He Could not Forbear Reflecting with Anger': Anger as Justification for Violence.

Like men of the middling sorts, poor men sometimes used anger at being approached by sodomites as a justification for acts of violence against them. Joseph Sellers, one of the agents of the SRM who raided Mother Clap's molly house in 1726, reported that informer Mark Partridge, who was pretending to be his husband, was so enraged by Orange Deb (Martin Mackintosh)'s seduction attempts on Sellers that Partridge "snatched a red hot pocker [sic] out of the fire and run it into his arse."<sup>679</sup> Samuel Prigg, a Spitalfields Plasterer and Pawnbroker, murdered Thomas Girl at the Ship and Anchor in Wheeler Street in 1746 during a quarrel in which the two men accused each other of sodomitical practices.<sup>680</sup> According to the account of James Gutherie, Ordinary of Newgate, who attended Prigg at his execution, Prigg insisted that, had he not been badly advised by his Council to plead guilty, and if instead he had explained that Girl had a history of extorting money from men by accusing them of sodomy, and that he had defamed Prigg because he would not give him five guineas, that the jury would have acquitted him. Rev. Gutherie had some concerns that Prigg was properly repentant at his death, "because he could

---

<sup>678</sup> *Public Ledger*, 10 Sept. 1810.

<sup>679</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1726, trial of Martin Mackintosh (t17260711-53).

<sup>680</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, May 1746, trial of Samuel Prigg (t17460515-20).

not forbear reflecting with anger and indignation on the vile actions of the Deceased, saying, he had done no more than what was properly the office of Jack Ketch.”<sup>681</sup> As was seen in Chapter 2, Samuel Drybutter was so badly beaten after attempting to seduce a soldier in St. James’ Park in 1777 that he was (falsely) reported in all the newspapers of having died of his injuries.

In 1810, one of the men tried (but acquitted) of sodomitical practices at the Swan in Vere Street, was attacked while walking in Covent Garden by Thomas Haylett, who worked for a tradesman in said street.<sup>682</sup> Alarmed by the sudden violence, watch-maker Robert Shearsmith interceded; Haylett then accused Shearsmith of being a sodomite and punched him in the mouth, nearly knocking out several teeth. Haylett subsequently published an apology declaring the falsity of the claim against Shearsmith, so that Shearsmith did not prosecute the assault. He did not do so against the sodomite he originally attacked; presumably, his having been tried for sodomitical practices was justification enough for violence.

While few men went as far as to murder men who accused them of sodomy or sodomitical practices, violence was frequently justified as the natural consequence of justifiable anger. John Campbell, a Glasgow shoemaker, was convicted of mobbing and rioting at the house of oil and colour man George Provand and sentenced to transportation in Van Dieman’s Land. In May 1829, Campbell’s mother tried to get him pardoned: as grounds for clemency, she argued that her son had not stolen anything, and, before this event, had a good character. He had, she insisted, acted on rumours that the victim, Mr. Provand used children for ‘unnatural purposes’, also that

---

<sup>681</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate’s Account, June 1746 (OA17460620).

<sup>682</sup> *Morning Advertiser*, 12 July 1810.



he murdered them and used their blood in paint manufacture. As supporting documents, she sent documents from M.P. Henry Monteith, declaring the ‘infamous’ character of Mr. Provand, and from James Anderson, clerk of the Justiciary, declaring that, since Campbell had been transported, George Provand had been indicted to stand trial for sodomy at Glasgow Circuit Court and failed to appear, and was thus outlawed. Despite this, John Campbell was not granted a pardon, but the matter was referred, in June 1826, to the Governor of the Van Dieman’s land colony.<sup>683</sup> As of June 1833, however, the Governor was still receiving his conduct reports.<sup>684</sup>

## Conclusion

As John Church discovered in his stay in Horsemonger Lane Gaol, men of sodomitical affections were frequently forced to wrestle with the passions of hope, fear, gratitude and anger. Fear was a constant presence in sodomitical encounters; there was a constant fear of discovery, fear of the consequences to one’s life and reputation should that discovery occur; fear of betrayal or blackmail. Some sodomites also used fear and intimidation as a technique to avoid detection, by threatening harm to their partners, should they reveal what had happened. Alternatively, gratitude and the offers of patronage and pecuniary support were offered as enticements to sodomy, and protection from the results of its refusal. Anger was frequently expressed against the body of the sodomite; it was frequently understood as justified by the enormity of the sodomite’s sinful existence, even to the point of justifying acts of murder and serious physical harm.

---

<sup>683</sup> HO 17/6/8 (Petition of John Campbell, 29 May 1822), TNA.

<sup>684</sup> CON 31/1/6/P178 (Conduct Register of Male Convicts: Campbell, John), LT. His conduct in Van Dieman’s Land was not very good – he was repeatedly found drunk, and often absent from muster and church.

This anger was justified through the evocation of God's wrath at sodomy, made all the worse by the lack of gratitude for God's gifts to humanity – by willfully refusing God's edict to 'go forth and multiply' through a perceived rejection of women and conjugal love. Sodomites were also ungratefully putting their nation and communities at risk, by inviting God's wrath upon England. Over the course of the century, sodomitical relationships became increasingly associated with death, danger, and doom. For William Beckford, thoughts of sex invariably conjured up images of death; only in death could he be with a beloved. The next chapter, Joy and Sadness, will consider how, over the course of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century, the sodomite became someone incapable of happiness.

## Chapter 4

### Joy and Sadness

In October 1805, George Gordon Byron, seventeen and recently arrived at Cambridge, met the fifteen-year old John Edlestone, who sang in the Trinity College Choir. Edlestone was fair and thin, with dark eyes, a refined mind, and humble origins. Byron quickly stepped into the role of aristocratic patron, calling Edlestone his protégé. Byron was attracted to Edlestone's voice, looks and personality; but it was his sorrow which turned attraction to love. Byron had given Edlestone substantial gifts of money. Edlestone, in return, gave Byron an inexpensive stone, a cornelian, cut in the shape of a heart. While doing so, Edlestone was so overcome by his worry that Byron would despise the gift that he burst into tears. Byron's heart melted at the sight of the crying youth and shed tears of his own. Later, Byron commemorated the occasion in two poems. The first, 'The Cornelian', describes the encounter:

Some, who can sneer at friendship's ties,  
Have, for my weakness, oft reprov'd me  
Yet still the simple gift I prize,  
For I am sure, the giver lov'd me.

He offer'd it with downcast look,  
As *fearful* that I might refuse it;  
I told him, when the gift I took,  
My *only fear* should be, to lose it.

This pledge attentively I view'd,  
And *sparkling* as I held it near,  
Methought one drop the stone bedew'd,  
And, ever since, *I've loved a tear*.<sup>685</sup>

---

<sup>685</sup> George Gordon Byron, *Fugitive Pieces [1806]*, ed. David Starner and William Flis, Project Gutenberg EBook Edition (Project Gutenberg, 2005), 57–58, <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/15368>.

In July 1807, Edlestone left Cambridge to take up a place in a mercantile house in London.

Inconsolable, Byron wrote to his friend Elizabeth Pigot (a neighbour of his mother's) of his sorrow at the loss.

I write with a *bottle of Claret* in my Head, & *tears in my eyes*, for I have just parted from 'my *Cornelian*' who spent the evening with me; as it was our last Interview, I postponed my engagements to devote the hours of the *Sabbath* to friendship, Edlestone & I have separated for the present, & my mind is a *Chaos of hope and Sorrow*.<sup>686</sup>

Byron told Elizabeth of his plans to reunite with Edlestone once he reached his majority, when Edlestone would decide either to become "a *Partner* through my Interest, or residing with me altogether." Regardless of which option Edlestone chose, Byron assured Elizabeth of the sincerity of his feelings: "I certainly *love* him more than any human being, & neither *time* or Distance have had the least effect on my (in general) changeable Disposition." Byron told her of his time together with Edlestone at Cambridge, where they met everyday, "without passing *one tiresome moment*, & separated *each time* with increasing Reluctance."

Edlestone died of consumption May 11, 1811, aged 21.<sup>687</sup> His death prompted no less than 7 elegies, and Byron would remember his relationship with Edlestone as something special. He would later describe it to Elizabeth's mother as "the then romance of the most romantic period of my life."<sup>688</sup> Byron and Edlestone's joy-filled friendship, sparked by pity, and ending in a

---

<sup>686</sup> George Gordon Byron to Elizabeth Pigot, 5 July 1807, printed in *Byron's Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of All the Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of All Others*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, vol. 8 (London: J. Murray, 1973), 124–25.

<sup>687</sup> George Gordon Byron to Mrs. Margaret Pigot, 28 Oct. 1811, printed in Rictor Norton, ed., *My Dear Boy: Gay Love Letters through the Centuries* (San Francisco: Leyland Publications, 1998), <http://rictornorton.co.uk/dearboy.htm>.

<sup>688</sup> Journal entry for 12 Jan. 1821, printed in *BLJ*, 1973, 8:24.

sorrowful parting and fond remembrances, shows the interplay between joy, sorrow, and sodomy. The following chapter will do the same.

## Joy, Sadness, and the Academy

If the long 18<sup>th</sup> century can be called the Age of Sensibility, the emotions of joy and sadness are the doorways into it. Men of taste and feeling fell into rapture at the sight of a waterfall and put forth the radical idea that human happiness was a right, one that could be achieved in this world. At the same time, melancholy was embraced, even celebrated. Scholarship on the topics of joy and sadness in this period has tended to fall into a few categories: funerals and festivals as collective outpourings of grief and joy; joy and sadness in literature; the relationship between happiness and virtue, and that between melancholy and depression.

Studies of sadness have considered the issue from several angles. Grief has largely been considered in the context of death and funerary practices.<sup>689</sup> Loss has largely been examined in literature,<sup>690</sup> and George Haggerty (1999) considers the public mourning for the dead friend, particularly the poetry of Thomas Gray, as a method of converting repressed homoerotic desire

---

<sup>689</sup> Death and funerary practices in early modern and modern Britain have a large historiography; some notable examples include David Cannadine, "War and Death, Grief and Mourning in Modern Britain," in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. Joachim Whaley (London: Europa Publications, 1981), 187–242; Ralph A. Houlbrooke, ed., *Death, Ritual, and Bereavement* (London ; New York: Routledge in association with the Social History Society of the United Kingdom, 1989); Esther H. Schor, *Bearing the Dead: The British Culture of Mourning from the Enlightenment to Victoria*, Literature in History (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1994); Patricia Jalland, *Death in War and Peace: Loss and Grief in England, 1914-1970* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

<sup>690</sup> Heather Dubrow, *Shakespeare and Domestic Loss: Forms of Deprivation, Mourning, and Recuperation*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 32 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Margo Swiss and David A. Kent, eds., *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton*, Medieval & Renaissance Literary Studies (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2002); William Watkin, *On Mourning: Theories of Loss in Modern Literature* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

into a socially acceptable form – it is only in mourning a loved one who has passed, that the desire for the body of the male friend becomes permissible.<sup>691</sup> In recent years, religious sorrow (sadness which provides pleasure through religious devotion and contemplation) has added intriguing dimensions to the relationship between loss and contentment; religion and the self.<sup>692</sup>

Considerations of sensibility have often revolved around pity and responses to suffering. Ann van Sant (1993) considers literary representations of suffering and responses to it in social and scientific context; particularly comparing literary pathos and scientific presentation in relation to repentant prostitutes and the children of the vagrant and criminal poor. She also considers the 18th-century debates about the role of sight and touch in epistemology and psychology, as context for the ‘man of feeling’, a spectator who registers his sensibility by physical means.<sup>693</sup>

Some scholars have considered the role of melancholy in 18<sup>th</sup>-century literature and culture,<sup>694</sup> and tied these with a history of depression.<sup>695</sup> Others have considered melancholy, not as a

---

<sup>691</sup> Haggerty, *Men in Love*. This trend continued into the 19<sup>th</sup> century; Tennyson’s *In Memoriam A.H.H.* is another good example of this, though by this point, he “hold[s] it half a sin / to put in words the grief...”

<sup>692</sup> Gary Kuchar, *The Poetry of Religious Sorrow in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Erin Sullivan, *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England*, First edition, *Emotions in History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); Alexandra Walsham, “The Happiness of Suffering,” in *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850: Narratives and Representations: A Collection to Honour Paul Slack*, ed. M. J. Braddick and Joanna Innes, The First Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 45–78.

<sup>693</sup> Ann Jessie Van Sant, *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

<sup>694</sup> Bridget Gellert Lyons, *Voices of Melancholy: Studies in Literary Treatments of Melancholy in Renaissance England*, Ideas and Forms in English Literature (London: Routledge, 1971); Guinn Batten, *The Orphaned Imagination: Melancholy and Commodity Culture in English Romanticism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); Douglas Trevor, *The Poetics of Melancholy in Early Modern England*, Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 48 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Allan Ingram et al., *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

<sup>695</sup> Julia Kristeva, *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*, European Perspectives (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989); Matthew Bell, *Melancholia: The Western Malady* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

disease that affected individuals, but as a fashion.<sup>696</sup> Clark Lawlor considers the role of class and gender in making some one more or less susceptible to the disease of melancholy – at least in the eyes of 18<sup>th</sup>-century doctors.<sup>697</sup> Matthew Bell, however, considers the perceived ‘national differences’ in melancholy in various European countries during the early modern period, as well as the roles of religion and capitalism in the spread and popularity of melancholy across Europe.<sup>698</sup> Erin Sullivan examines the important distinctions made by Renaissance writers between types of sadness – grief, godly sorrow, despair and melancholy, and the interactions they produced in mind, body, and soul. Importantly, she points to Reformation ideas about the nature of devotion and salvation which worked to transform sadness into a positive, transformative experience.<sup>699</sup>

Studies of happiness have tended to deal with the relationship between happiness and virtue. In *The Passion for Happiness* (2000), Adam Potkay considers the shared ground of Samuel Johnson and David Hume as moralists: tracing their central concerns from Hellenistic philosophy (as conveyed by Cicero), to earlier writers such as Addison and Mandeville. Potkay sees Johnson and Hume’s diverse writings unified by several key questions: What is happiness? What is the role of virtue in the happy life? And what is the proper relationship between passion and

---

<sup>696</sup> Scholars taking this view include Clark Lawlor, “Fashionable Melancholy,” in *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*, by Allan Ingram et al. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 25–53; Bell, *Melancholia*.

<sup>697</sup> Lawlor, “Fashionable Melancholy,” 30, 44–51.

<sup>698</sup> Bell, *Melancholia*, 104–24.

<sup>699</sup> Sullivan, *Beyond Melancholy*.

reflection in the happy individual?<sup>700</sup> According to Darrin McMahon's *Happiness: A History* (2006), which traces the evolution of the concept of happiness in Western thought, the 18<sup>th</sup> century began the transformation of happiness not just as an earthly possibility but an earthly entitlement. McMahon surveys understandings of happiness held by the ancient Greeks, the Romans, the early/ medieval Christians, and how those came to be transformed in the age of the Enlightenment. McMahon then examines the tragic experiments of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries to eliminate misery and extend happiness to all.<sup>701</sup>

Barbara Ehrenreich's *Dancing in the Streets* (2006) considers the erosion and disappearance of communal expressions of joy – processions, dancing, carnivals, and popular festivals - and their replacement in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries with spectacles such as concerts and rallies. She argues that in the disappearance of carnival humanity has lost a crucial part of the human experience.<sup>702</sup> Adam Potkay in *The Story of Joy* (2007) considers the differences between joy and happiness and examines the different ways European cultures have expressed and understood joy, from the medieval troubadours to Reformation theologians and moral philosophers.<sup>703</sup>

---

<sup>700</sup> Adam Potkay, *The Passion for Happiness: Samuel Johnson and David Hume* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 2000).

<sup>701</sup> Darrin M. McMahon, *Happiness: A History* (New York: Grove Press, 2006).

<sup>702</sup> Barbara Ehrenreich, *Dancing in the Streets: A History of Collective Joy* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006). While not an academic work, her argument tracing the change of happiness from the communal and active to the individual and passive is in keeping with much of the historiography.

<sup>703</sup> Adam Potkay, *The Story of Joy: From the Bible to Late Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).



In *Mourning Happiness* (2010), Vivasvan Soni finds that over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the idea of happiness was transformed by a number of discourses, including the emerging novel, sentimentalism and moral theory, until “happiness had become a mere feeling and been voided of all ethical or political content.”<sup>704</sup> Soni argues that the novel transformed the classical ideal of happiness as living civic virtue into a sentiment through suspending it until the end of the narrative, where it is achieved either in marriage (*Pamela*) or redemption (*Clarissa*). Sentimentalism then legitimizes that affective conception of happiness; moral theorists such as Kant, Hegel and Bentham take this transformed concept of happiness and banish it to the realm of family and marriage. This point has been frequently articulated by literary scholars and will be discussed below.

The essays in Michael Braddick and Joanna Innes’ recent collection, *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850* (2017), engage with various aspects of suffering and happiness.<sup>705</sup> Phil Withington’s “The Invention of Happiness” traces the changes in meaning attached to the word ‘happiness’ throughout published texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. He notes that happiness increasingly came to refer to a subjective state of well-being, rather than the previous sense of felicity, a good state arising from fortune or luck.<sup>706</sup> Joanna Innes’ own contribution to the volume considers the relationship between various understandings of ‘happiness’ and politics in

---

<sup>704</sup> Vivasvan Soni, *Mourning Happiness: Narrative and the Politics of Modernity* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010), 9.

<sup>705</sup> M. J. Braddick and Joanna Innes, eds., *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850: Narratives and Representations: A Collection to Honour Paul Slack*, First edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

<sup>706</sup> Phil Withington, “The Invention of ‘Happiness,’” in *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850: Narratives and Representations: A Collection to Honour Paul Slack*, ed. M. J. Braddick and Joanna Innes, First edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 23–56.

the late 18<sup>th</sup>- and early 19<sup>th</sup>-centuries; happiness could be an individual feeling, a social experience, a spiritual state, or political imperative. She argues that, during the difficult and hard years of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars, the ideal that good government promoted the happiness of the people, embraced by both radical reformers and loyalists, caused a political flashpoint due to vastly different understandings of the term.<sup>707</sup>

## Joy and Sadness in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Thought.

Just as one of William Blake's characters asks "... what is a joy, ... and in what rivers swim the sorrows? ... That I might ... bring comforts into a present sorrow and a night of pain?"<sup>708</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>-century scholars were intrigued by the emotions of joy and sorrow. Richard Terry observes that "the nomenclature surrounding both gaiety and misery has mutated over time." Words like 'blithe', 'glee' and 'jocund' have largely passed from common parlance, and 'gay' has a different meaning.<sup>709</sup> As Adam Potkay observes, Shaw uses 'happy' seven times more than 'joy', while Shakespeare used them with the same frequency.<sup>710</sup> As well, the 'rich lexicon' possessed by 18<sup>th</sup>-century writers to deal with mental anguish is reduced, and 'sorrow has become for us a confined and reactive emotion'.<sup>711</sup> John Kersey's dictionary defined Grief as

---

<sup>707</sup> Joanna Innes, "Happiness Contested: Happiness and Politics in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries," in *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850: Narratives and Representations: A Collection to Honour Paul Slack*, ed. M. J. Braddick and Joanna Innes, First Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 87–120.

<sup>708</sup> William Blake, *Visions of the Daughters of Albion* [1793], ed. Robert N. Essick (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2002), 8.

<sup>709</sup> Richard Terry, "Philosophical Melancholy," in *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*, by Allan Ingram et al. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 55.

<sup>710</sup> Potkay, *The Story of Joy*, 1.

<sup>711</sup> Terry, "Philosophical Melancholy," 56.

“Sorrow, trouble. A Grievance, any Injury or Wrong which affords matter of Trouble”<sup>712</sup> and Nathan Bailey considered Sorrow “an Uneasiness of Mind upon the consideration of some Good lost.”<sup>713</sup> Samuel Johnson found Melancholy to be “a gloomy, pensive, discounted temper”, but also “a disease... known to arise from too heavy and too viscid blood: its cure is in evacuation, nervous medicines, and powerful stimuli.”<sup>714</sup> John Ash found Joy to be “the passion produced by any prosperous event; gladness; exultation; happiness; felicity; gaiety”<sup>715</sup>; while being happy, for James Barclay (1799), was “a state where the desires and wishes are satisfied, and the greatest pleasures are enjoyed.”<sup>716</sup>

Moralists were keen on supplying the relationship of the different degrees of joy and sadness to each other. Isaac Watts presented such a system in his *Doctrine of the Passions* in 1737: moderate joy was gladness, and moderate grief is trouble, or uneasiness of mind. Sudden bursts of either were exultation or anguish. If fear coexists with grief, it is horror. Contentment is a gladness of heart, and satisfaction is reached through achieving one’s desires. Mirth is joy caused by amusement and signalled by laughter. Habitual joy is cheerfulness, and habitual sorrow is melancholy, “a sinking sadness oppressing the whole man.”<sup>717</sup> Watts’ system would remain influential on systems of the passions throughout the century. Thomas Cogan, who published his *Philosophical Treatise on the Passions* in 1800, kept the relation of the different degrees of joy

---

<sup>712</sup> Kersey, *A New English Dictionary*, 1702, 110.

<sup>713</sup> Bailey, *Dictionary Britannicum*, 650.

<sup>714</sup> Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755], 1281.

<sup>715</sup> Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*, 522.

<sup>716</sup> Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1799, dxxxiv.

<sup>717</sup> Watts, *The Doctrine of the Passions Explain’d and Improv’d*, 44–45.

largely intact. Joy is “a vivid pleasure or delight, inspired by the immediate reception of something particularly grateful” or “by our liberation from fearful apprehensions, or from a state of actual distress.”<sup>718</sup> Quieter than joy was gladness, and cheerfulness gentler still; mirth, contentment and satisfaction were pleasurable states of mind caused by enjoyment of objects or situations.<sup>719</sup>

Moralists also considered the relationship of joy and sorrow with each other; and especially considered the impact of memory in the experience of both. Thomas Gordon considered grief to be one of the great destroyers of human happiness, as even reflecting on former delights renews the sense of loss and anguish.<sup>720</sup> Isaac Watts, however, found that recollection of past joys could still give pleasure, though mixed with grief, while “the Remembrance of former Sorrows has some Bitterness in it, ... but it is a Matter of Joy to think they are finished and shall not return.”<sup>721</sup>

Melancholy, the ‘fashionable disease’ of the early modern period, upset some of these systems, as a great number of people seemed to enjoy being unhappy. Thomas Gordon observed in 1720 that “There is a gloomy Pleasure in being dejected and inconsolable... and Sorrow finds wonderful Relief in being still more sorrowful.”<sup>722</sup> Thomas Gray observed to Richard West, that “Mine ... is a white Melancholy, or rather Leucocholy for the most part; which, though it ...

---

<sup>718</sup> Cogan, *A Philosophical Treatise on the Passions*, 65.

<sup>719</sup> Cogan, 67–69.

<sup>720</sup> Gordon, *The Humourist*, 2:150.

<sup>721</sup> Watts, *The Doctrine of the Passions Explain'd and Improv'd*, 46.

<sup>722</sup> Gordon, *The Humourist*, 2:150.

[never] amounts to what one calls Joy or Pleasure, yet is a good easy sort of state, and *ça ne laisse que de s'amuser*.”<sup>723</sup> Samuel Johnson chastised James Boswell for always complaining of melancholy. Suggesting that Boswell did so to evoke “either praise or pity,” Johnson told Boswell to stop discussing his “mental diseases” in public, “...for praise there is no room, and pity will do you no good; therefore, from this hour speak no more, think no more, about them.”<sup>724</sup>

The extremes of joy and grief take away the ability to speak words but are expressed physically. Henry Fielding, in *A Journey from this World to the Next* (1743), described the joy of being reunited with a dead daughter, “Good Gods ! what Words can describe the Raptures, the melting passionate Tenderness, with which we kiss’d each other, continuing our Embrace, with the most ecstatic Joy, a Space, which if Time had been measured here as on Earth, could not be less than half a Year.”<sup>725</sup> Twenty years later, Horace Walpole described being faced with both grief and joy in rapid succession. Receiving news of a friend’s illness shortly followed by that of Henry Conway’s arrival, Walpole was overcome. He observed to George Montagu, “These two opposite strokes of terror and joy overcame me so much, that when I got to Mr. Conway’s, I could not speak to him, but burst into a flood of tears.”<sup>726</sup>

---

<sup>723</sup> Thomas Gray to Richard West, 27 May 1742. Printed in Thomas Gray and William Mason, *The Letters of Thomas Gray, Including the Correspondence of Gray and Mason*, ed. Duncan C. Tovey, vol. 1 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1900), 102–3, <https://archive.org/details/lettersofthomasgray01grayuoft>.

<sup>724</sup> Samuel Johnson to James Boswell, 20 Jan. 1780, printed in Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson L.L.D. [1791]*, ii:299–300.

<sup>725</sup> Henry Fielding, *Miscellanies*, vol. 2 (London: Printed for the author, and sold by A. Millar, 1743), 63.

<sup>726</sup> Horatio Walpole, London, to George Montagu, 6 April 1763. Printed in Horace Walpole, *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, Digital Collection, vol. 1 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1937), 55–56.

Joy and grief are sudden, overwhelming, unspeakable. Happiness and melancholy are something different again. Samuel Johnson, deeply affected by the death of his wife, resolved to hang onto his grief, “which he cherished with a kind of sacred fondness,” but could not hold onto it for long. Discussing the topic with Boswell and Dr. Taylor, he observed that “[a]ll grief for what cannot in the course of nature be helped, soon wears away... it never continues very long, unless where there is madness, ... for all unnecessary grief is unwise, and therefore will not be long retained by a sound mind.”<sup>727</sup> The Rev. John Church found that his grief on being apprenticed away from the Foundling Hospital, the only home he had ever known, was soon mended: “... the few first nights I wept aloud ... but the hand of time wiped away my grief, and a variety of new scenes began to open to my view.”<sup>728</sup> For the melancholic Thomas Gray, low spirits were his “true and faithful companions.” As he told Richard West, “they get up with me, go to bed with me, make journeys and returns as I do; nay, and pay visits, and will even affect to be jocose, and force a feeble laugh with me; but most commonly we sit alone together...”<sup>729</sup>

Happiness is neo-classical in its reinterpretation of ancient Greek ethics: “a secular ideal of rational contentment through ethical conduct.”<sup>730</sup> Derived from ancient Greek ethics, moral philosophers since Plato “agreed that the best way to achieve a happy life was in the rational exercise of the virtues (wisdom, justice, courage, and so forth).”<sup>731</sup> In the 18<sup>th</sup> century

---

<sup>727</sup> Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson L.L.D. [1791]*, ii:102.

<sup>728</sup> Church, *The Foundling; or, the Child of Providence*, 27–28.

<sup>729</sup> Thomas Gray to Richard West, London, 22 Aug. 1737. Printed in *The Letters of Thomas Gray*, 1:6.

<sup>730</sup> Potkay, *The Story of Joy*, 21.

<sup>731</sup> Potkay, 21.

philosophers transformed happiness into an achievable social ideal. Happiness was the “self-enjoyment which arises from a consistency of life and manners, a harmony of affections, a freedom from ... shame or guilt, and a consciousness of worth and merit with all mankind, our society, country and friends.”<sup>732</sup>

Public happiness, or the material and social wellbeing of the aggregate of individuals in a community, is “the Enlightenment’s chief contributions to the history of ideas.”<sup>733</sup> Public happiness could be gauged by measurements and required sound political institutions. Legal reform, religious toleration, and (limited) public education were frequent suggestions, and Mary Wollstonecraft extended public happiness to include domestic happiness, which depended on women receiving a rational education.<sup>734</sup> Bentham’s utilitarian formula, that it is the greatest happiness of the greatest number that is the measure of right and wrong, represented happiness as something that “could and should be the subject of measurement.”<sup>735</sup> Some doubted if this were truly achievable: Samuel Johnson observed that men were never happy, except when drunk.<sup>736</sup>

This vision of happiness was constantly at odds with the older, Christian concept that true happiness could only be achieved in the world to come. Instead, mankind should aim for

---

<sup>732</sup> Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* [1711], 2:148–50.

<sup>733</sup> Potkay, *The Story of Joy*, 22.

<sup>734</sup> Potkay, 22.

<sup>735</sup> J.H. Burns, “Happiness and Utility: Jeremy Bentham’s Equation,” *Utilitas* 17, no. 1 (2005): 48. Bentham first use the phrase in 1776, but drew on concepts from Francis Hutcheson (1725) and Cesare Beccaria (1764). Cf. Robert Shackleton, *The Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number: The History of Bentham’s Phrase*, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 90 (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1972).

<sup>736</sup> Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson L.L.D.* [1791], ii:7. Drinking was the one thing a man should not do, however, to cure himself of melancholy.

contentment; some felt that “Contentedness is Happiness”.<sup>737</sup> John Fielding suggested that “... men, instead of presuming to be happy, [should] study to be easy. He ... should turn his thoughts upon allaying his pain, rather than promoting his joy; for great inquietude is to be avoided, but great felicity is not to be attained.”<sup>738</sup> Clergyman William Davy believed true happiness was achievable only in the world to come, where there would be no pain and grief, tears and sorrow. There would be no danger, no violence, hatred or hostility, no strife, no fraud or falsehood. Instead, “Truth, Peace, Harmony, Joy, Benevolence, unfeigned Love and universal Charity will prevail throughout; fill every Breast, and overflow the Regions of Bliss.”<sup>739</sup>

Whether or not true happiness and joy were achievable in this world, they were stronger when shared. Joy and sorrow could easily spread. As David Hume observed, “A cheerful countenance infuses a sensible complacency and serenity into my mind; as an angry or sorrowful one throws a sudden damp on me. ... I feel more from communication than from my own natural temper and disposition.”<sup>740</sup> Without at least one person with whom to share happiness, only misery is possible.<sup>741</sup> Sharing pain with those who are suffering was also essential: without pity, “Sorrow would be many Times utterly insupportable.”<sup>742</sup>

---

<sup>737</sup> Gordon, *The Humourist*, 2:170.

<sup>738</sup> Fielding, *The Universal Mentor; Containing, Essays on the Most Important Subjects in Life.*, 112.

<sup>739</sup> William Davy, *A System of Divinity, in a Course of Sermons, on the First Institutions of Religion*, vol. 6 (Lustleigh, Devon: Printed by Himself, 1797), 475–76, 478.

<sup>740</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 317.

<sup>741</sup> Hume, 363.

<sup>742</sup> Gordon, *The Humourist*, 2:151.



## Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy.

Writing of the death of a friend, the painter George James, who had fled to avoid prosecution for sodomy, Hester Thrale Piozzi reflected on the sadness of his fate, and remembered the joy he brought to his friends and family. If he had been able to stay in England, she reflected, he “must have been ... the delight of every Circle where pleasure is sought in the Company of airy good humour & elegant Hilarity.” Instead, he had been driven to France, where people “did not – I dare say – detest his odious Propensity – as much as those who drove him from Society in England did.” She believed he had perished in the Terror.<sup>743</sup> In that, Thrale saw the justice of heaven, which “pursues such horrid Violation of its Laws with Vengeance first or last.”<sup>744</sup>

As was seen in the previous chapter, William Guthrie’s reply to Horace Walpole’s defence of his cousin slyly insinuated that, in being born a man, Walpole was doomed to the “unhappy situation” of a love which could never be countenanced or recognized. Unable to love a woman, the source of domestic happiness, the sodomite was doomed to a life of sadness and danger. By virtue of their disgusting nature, their “odious propensity,” sodomites were excluded from the delight and joy of society. Over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the figure of the sodomite as a doomed and unhappy creature, forever hovering at the edge of happiness, came to dominate discourse. As domesticity came to be seen not only as the source of happiness, but also of charity

---

<sup>743</sup> In this, she was mistaken; he was released from Prison after the fall of Robespierre but died later at Boulogne. Cf. Hester Lynch Piozzi, *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*, ed. Katherine Canby Balderston, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942), 926 n3.

<sup>744</sup> Hester Thrale Piozzi, Diary entry for 11 May 1795. Printed in Piozzi, 2:926–27.

and pity, the sodomite was reconfigured as being incapable of both. This chapter will consider the emotions of joy and sadness and their intersections with sodomy.

### Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy in Elite Circles.

William Beckford met the boy who would change the course of his life during the tour of England he made in the summer of 1779. Staying at Powderham Castle, near Exeter, he met young William, the darling of the nursery. William ‘Kitty’ Courtenay, 3<sup>rd</sup> Viscount Courtenay, and the future 9<sup>th</sup> Earl of Devon, was then 11 years old: “a girlish boy of intelligence and sensibility.” Beckford, 19, fell deeply in love with him “in a sentimental way.”<sup>745</sup> The next spring, Beckford arranged for Courtenay to get leave from school to have his portrait painted in London. Beckford managed to see the boy for an hour during the visit. As he later related to his friend and former teacher Alexander Cozens, the encounter filled him with both joy and sadness.

I have seen him tho’ it was but for an hour, and have now but too full an idea of the swiftness of happy moments ... Judge how I felt upon his telling me that his head had run on nothing but me since we parted, that Fonthill had been ever in his dreams ... But all my miseries are renewed when I consider how seldom I am doomed to be with him, how little his father or mother comprehend the nature of my love. Who can enter into its refinements, who feel its ardour, without one friend but you to whom I can disclose my melancholy sensations...<sup>746</sup>

According to Beckford, the encounter was equally emotional for the young Courtenay, whose countenance at one moment was “as lovely as light”, and the next covered with “a dark shade”;

---

<sup>745</sup> Alexander, *England’s Wealthiest Son*, 70. Like Halsband’s ‘sentimental sodomy’ mentioned in Chapter 2, Alexander here refers to a romantic and sensual relationship that was not (yet) sexual. Alexander and George Haggerty have doubts as to whether the relationship was ever sexual; while Rictor Norton, drawing on the age of future youths with whom Beckford fell in love, argues that the relationship became sexual when Courtenay was in his early teens. Cf. Alexander, Chapt. 8; Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House*, 221–26; Haggerty, *Men in Love*, Chap. 5.

<sup>746</sup> William Beckford to Alexander Cozens, 16 April 1780. Quoted in Alexander, *England’s Wealthiest Son*, 70.

sometimes his eyes “sparkled with vivacity”, a moment later they “glistened with tears.”

Returning to his London house “melancholy and alone”, Beckford “wept like a poor miserable being cast away on a desert world, *deprived of the best part of its existence*.”<sup>747</sup> These moments of “liveliest happiness and deepest dejection” demonstrate several of the degrees of joy and sorrow faced by sodomitical elites. The following two subsections will consider the ways that elite men dealt with joy, sadness, and sodomy.

### “I No Longer Sought for Spring”: Joy and Sodomy in Elite Circles

A key aspect of the expression of joy among men who loved men in the long 18th century was the role of memory. Joy was fleeting, but memories and keepsakes (letters, gifts, locks of hair) extended the emotion by allowing it to be relived even years later. In June of 1727 looking at the bruises and scratches on his body caused Lord Hervey a renewal of pleasure through memory.

As he wrote to Stephen Fox,

You have left some such remembrancers behind you, that I assure you (if ‘tis any satisfaction to you to know it) you are not in the least Danger of being forgotten. The favours I have received at Your Honour’s Hands are of such a Nature that tho’ the impression might wear out of my Mind, yet they are written in such lasting characters upon every Limb, that ‘tis impossible for me to look on a Leg or an Arm without having my Memory refresh’d. I have some thoughts of exposing the marks of your pollisonerie [lewdness] to move Compassion, ... they have remain’d so long that I begin to think they are ... indelible.<sup>748</sup>

---

<sup>747</sup> William Beckford to Alexander Cozens, 16 April 1780. Quoted in Alexander, 71. Lacking any account of this encounter by Courtenay, who was only 12, Beckford’s description of Courtenay’s feelings must be taken with some suspicion.

<sup>748</sup> Lord Hervey to Stephen Fox, 1 June 1727, printed in Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 90.

Clearly, the marks on Hervey's body did eventually fade – for a year later Hervey was relying on a different keepsake to bring the joy of being with Stephen to mind:

Walk often through Hervey groves and now and then visit the \_\_\_\_ by the pas-glissant! I want no memorandums, even your picture is useless in your character, my imagination is so much a better painter than Zink yet I find you drawn there not only more like than by his hand, but also in colours fixed by so much better a fire, yet tis impossible they should ever fade, till the thing on which they are so lovingly laid is itself destroyed, nor is it all, for this painter not only describes your figure but your face, 'tis an echo to your words, as well as a mirror to your form, and so extraordinary a performer in each capacity, that I hear you in deadliest silence and see you in deepest darkness.<sup>749</sup>

Looking at Fox's portrait, visiting places where they had spent time together, gives spark and fire to Hervey's imagination; all his senses are engaged – he hears his voice, and sees his face, and the bruises allow him to feel Fox's presence even after he has left.

Talking over past joys was a way of keeping it alive. In a 1736 letter to his old schoolfellow George Montagu, Horace Walpole reflected on the great amount of happiness he found in remembering and talking about the innocent adventures of his youth, though he denied that joy was absent from his present or future.

I agree with you entirely in the pleasure you take in talking over old stories, but can't say but I meet every day with new circumstances, which will be still more pleasure to me to recollect. I think at our age 'tis excess of joy, to think, while we are running over past happinesses, that 'tis still in our power to enjoy as great. ... and old men cannot be said to be children a second time with greater truth from any one cause, than their living over again their childhood in imagination. To reflect on the season when first they felt the titillation of love, the budding passions, and the first dear object of their wishes ! how unexperienced they gave credit to all the tales of romantic loves! Dear George, were not the playing fields at Eton food for all manner of flights? ... You see how deep you have

---

<sup>749</sup> Lord Hervey to Stephen Fox, 18 June 1728, printed in Eric Weichel, "'Fixed by so Much Better a Fire': Wigs and Masculinity in Early 18th-Century British Miniatures," *Shift: Queen's Journal of Visual & Material Culture*, no. 1 (2008): 1. Zink was a popular painter of miniature pictures. Weichel argues that the relationship to luxury items and consumer culture allowed elite men more freedom to publicly express their feelings for each other.

carried me into old stories; I write of them with pleasure, but shall talk of them with more to you ...<sup>750</sup>

A few years later, in his *Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College* (1742; published 1747), Thomas Gray thought back on the joy and innocence of his years at Eton college, where he first met Walpole, and Richard West:

Ah happy hills, ah pleasing shade,  
 Ah fields beloved in vain,  
 Where once my careless childhood strayed,  
 A stranger yet to pain!  
 I feel the gales, that from ye blow,  
 A momentary bliss bestow,  
 As waving fresh their gladsome wing  
 My weary soul they seem to soothe,  
 And, redolent of joy and youth,  
 To breathe a second spring.<sup>751</sup>

For Gray, thoughts of seeing Richard West evoked thoughts of spring and happiness. Shaken out of his usual “low spirits” by a letter from West inviting him to visit, he told West that “... May seems to be come since your invitation; and I propose to bask in her beams and dress me in her roses.”<sup>752</sup>

A few months after William Beckford had the portrait of young William Courtenay painted, he left England on a Grand Tour. Beckford lingered in Paris in April 1781, troubled in heart and mind after his friend Lady Hamilton (Catherine Barlow, Sir William Hamilton’s first wife) condemned his romantic feelings for a Venetian youth, which he had confided in her, as a

---

<sup>750</sup> Horace Walpole to George Montagu, 6 May 1736. Printed in Walpole, *Horace Walpole’s Correspondence*, 1937, 9:2–4.

<sup>751</sup> Thomas Gray, *An Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College* (London: Printed for R. Dodsley, 1747), 4, <http://www.thomasgray.org/cgi-bin/view.cgi?collection=primary&edition=1747>.

<sup>752</sup> Thomas Gray to Richard West, 27 May 1742. Printed in *The Letters of Thomas Gray*, 1:102–3.

“criminal passion.” There he was lifted out of his melancholy by his love of William Courtenay. He wrote on a scrap of paper that he was “nothing less than cured.” “The first object of my thoughts is always my little C. Filled with thoughts of him, I spend hours at my clavichord, recalling moments ...”<sup>753</sup> Later in the same jotting, he described this radical change in his emotions: walks in the woods revealed beauty everywhere. When he sat down and read a letter from William “tears of joy and tenderness” filled his eyes. Filled with the joy of his letter, he suddenly felt it was spring, and even looked in the woods for cowslips!

In ‘Pignus Amoris’, a poem written to commemorate his Cambridge relationship with John Edlestone, Lord Byron reflects on the immortality of remembered joy. In this poem, the narrator uses a keepsake, “a toy of blushing hue” (i.e. the cornelian mentioned in chapter 2) to recall the memory of his Friend. This poem was written in 1806 or 1807, when their relationship was coming to an end – but the phrasing, ‘many a weary day gone by’, and ‘still I view in Memory’s eye’, speaks to a remembered joy that is eternal.

As by the fix’d decrees of Heaven,  
 ‘Tis vain to hope that Joy can last  
 The dearest boon that Life has given,  
 To me is – visions of the past.

For these this toy of blushing hue  
 I prize with zeal before unknown,  
 It tells me of a Friend I knew,  
 Who loved me for myself alone.

...  
 Though many a weary day gone by,  
 With time the gift is dearer grown;  
 And still I view in Memory’s eye

---

<sup>753</sup> William Beckford, undated French jotting on the same page as a phrase which appears again in a letter to Lady Hamilton from Paris, 2 April 1781. Quoted in Alexander, *England’s Wealthiest Son*, 78.

That teardrop sparkle through my own.

And heartless Age perhaps will smile,  
Or wonder whence those feelings sprung;  
Yet let not sterner souls revile,  
For Both were open, Both were young.

And Youth is sure the only time,  
When Pleasure blends no base alloy;  
When Life is blest without a crime,  
And Innocence resides with Joy.<sup>754</sup>

Through letters, keepsakes, and shared memories, elite men who loved men kept the joy of intimacy alive over distance, time apart, and growing opposition to their feelings. Joy is innocence, joy is youth; joy is spring: it is transitory, yet eternal. Joy connects people together, and, through memory, keeps relationships alive. Recalling past joys could also bring sadness, a renewal of their loss. Companion then with joy was sorrow and loss.

### “Tinged by Time with Sorrow’s Hue”: Sadness and Sodomy in Elite Circles

In August 1811, Byron returned home to Newstead after two years visit to Spain, Greece and Turkey. His return was marked by a series of emotional blows. Within a month, death claimed three people: a friend from Harrow died of a fever in Portugal in late July; his mother died at the beginning of August; and one of his closest friends from Cambridge, Charles Skinner Matthews, drowned in the Cam only two days later. As he observed to R.C. Dallas, he had recently heard

---

<sup>754</sup> *Byron’s Poetical Works Vol. 3 [1900]*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge, Jonathan Ingram, and David Cortesi, Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition (Project Gutenberg, 2007), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/21811/21811-h/21811-h.htm>. Ernest Coleridge, who first published the poem in 1898 from the MS at Newstead, dated this poem to 1806; I believe a date of 1807 is more likely, as it was in the spring of that year that he was separated from Edlestone; and this poem speaks to the end of that relationship.

from them all, but was not able to see any of them before they died.<sup>755</sup> Indeed, Charles Matthews had written to him the day before his death. Byron told a mutual friend two days after receiving the letter: “Matthews’s last letter was written on *Friday* – on Saturday he was not.”<sup>756</sup> He spent September in Lancashire and returned home in early October only to be shocked again with unwelcome news: John Edlestone had died in May, while Byron’s ship was sailing near Malta.

As Byron told another friend from Cambridge, Francis Hodgson, who was soon to be ordained,

I heard of a death the other day that shocked me more than any of the preceding, of one whom I once loved more than I ever loved a living thing, & one who I believe loved me to the last, yet I had not a tear left for an event which five years ago would have bowed me to the dust; still it sits heavy on my heart & calls back what I wish to forget, in many a feverish dream.<sup>757</sup>

Byron and Edlestone had clearly not taken up housekeeping upon Byron’s majority. Byron admitted to John Cam Hobhouse,<sup>758</sup> and Mrs. Margaret Pigot,<sup>759</sup> that he had not expected to encounter Edlestone again and had not seen him for some time prior to his death. He gave his cornelian heart ring to Elizabeth Pigot before he left for the Levant, and wrote to her mother to beg for its return: “as it was the only memorial I possessed of that person (in whom I was once much interested) it has acquired a value by this event, I could have wished it never to have borne

---

<sup>755</sup> George Gordon Byron to R.C. Dallas, 12 Aug. 1811. Printed in George Gordon Byron and Thomas Moore, *Life, Letters, and Journals of Lord Byron* (London: J. Murray, 1839), 132. He would go on to lose two more people before the end of 1811.

<sup>756</sup> George Gordon Byron to Scrope Davies, 7 Aug. 1811. Printed in Byron and Moore, 129.

<sup>757</sup> George Gordon Byron to Francis Hodgson, 10 Oct. 1811, printed in Norton, *My Dear Boy: Gay Love Letters through the Centuries*.

<sup>758</sup> George Gordon Byron to John Cam Hobhouse, 13 Oct. 1811, printed in Norton.

<sup>759</sup> George Gordon Byron to Mrs. Margaret Pigot, 28 Oct. 1811, printed in Norton.



in my eyes.”<sup>760</sup> Cambridge itself became almost too painful to visit: in February 1812 he asked Francis Hodgson to visit him in London, in order to spare himself and Hobhouse (Matthews’s closest friend) going to Cambridge, which would “bring sad recollections to him [Hobhouse], and worse to me, though for very different reasons.” For Byron, the place was forever tainted by irrecoverable loss – “I believe the only human being, that ever loved me in truth and entirely, was of, or belonging to, Cambridge and ... no change can now take place.”<sup>761</sup>

Byron’s grief at the loss of Edlestone, coming as it did while he was dealing with so much death, led to seven poems, six of which were published in *Childe Harold I and II*, the book of poetry which made Byron famous overnight.<sup>762</sup> These six poems, despite the subject being disguised by a female name and pronouns, are clearly inspired by his grief for the loss of Edlestone.<sup>763</sup> The poems in the ‘Thryza’ cycle, include “To Thryza,” “Away, away, ye notes of woe!” “One Struggle More and I am Free”, “And Thou Art Dead, as Young and Fair”, “If Sometimes in the

---

<sup>760</sup> According to Byron’s good friend and biographer Thomas Moore, the heart was not only returned, but Byron later reminded Miss Pigot that he had left it with her for safe keeping only, not as a gift. Cf. George Gordon Byron and Thomas Moore, *The Works of Lord Byron: With His Letters and Journals, and His Life* (London: John Murray, 1835), 164.

<sup>761</sup> George Gordon Byron to Francis Hodgson, 16 Feb. 1812, printed in George Gordon Byron, *The Works of Byron: Letters and Journals* [1898], ed. Rowland E. Prothero, Project Gutenberg EBook, vol. 2 (Project Gutenberg, 2011), letter 224, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/9921/9921-h/9921-h.htm>.

<sup>762</sup> The last, found in 1974 among the Murray MSS, was published under the title ‘Edlestone’ in 1980, in the first volume of Jeremy McCann’s edition of Byron’s poetry. Written in Latin, with the name ‘Edlestone’ written three times above the verses, it begins ‘Te, te, care puer’ (You, my precious boy), and is the only one of the seven poems which does not disguise the beloved’s gender.

<sup>763</sup> Frederick Greene discusses how Shelley dealt with the increasing societal attack on same-sex male grief. Cf. Frederick Greene, “Writing Between Life and Death: Postmetaphysics and the Psychosexual Dynamics of Elegy in Shelley’s Adonais,” in *Mapping Male Sexuality: Nineteenth Century England*, ed. Jay Losey and William D. Brewer (London: Associated University Presses, 2000), 123–42. Later in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, A.E. Housman would similarly deal with his grief for the loss of the man he loved, Moses John Jackson, through poetry. As with Byron, Housman disguises the origins of his feelings.

Haunts of Men” and “On a Cornelian Heart Which was Broken.” That they refer to Edlestone is made clear by the references in both to the cornelian, “the pledge we wore” (“To Thryza”), “my Thryza’s pledge ... tinged ... with Sorrow’s hue!” (“One Struggle More and I am Free”), and “On a Cornelian Heart which was Broken” compares the broken token to his own broken heart. Some mention Edlestone’s role as chorister, “the voice that made those sounds more sweet” (“Away, away, ye notes of woe”).<sup>764</sup> “And Thou Art Dead, as Young and Fair”, written in February 1812, expresses identical sentiments to those in his letter to Francis Hodgson. The poem, like the letter, philosophizes that it was perhaps better that Edlestone had died while young, as it spared Byron the pain of watching him grow old and decay. Others deeply regret that he was not in England during Edlestone’s last illness, and so unable to hold him before he died. This is expressed in “To Thryza”, “One Struggle More and I am Free”, and “And Thou Art Dead, as Young and Fair”.

In eulogizing his dead friend, Byron was following a long-established literary tradition – in hiding the fact that he was so doing under a female name and pronouns, however, marked how such depth of feeling between two men had become suspect. One of Thomas Gray’s most celebrated poems, his “Sonnet [On the Death of Richard West]”, written in 1742, and first published in 1747, expresses many of the same feelings as Byron’s poems on the death of John Edlestone; openly, publicly, and honestly. For him, the shining sun, singing birds and beautiful fields have no appeal, because he “fruitlessly mourn to him that cannot hear, / and weep the more

---

<sup>764</sup> Text of all six poems taken from *Byron’s Poetical Works Vol. 3 [1900]*.

because I weep in vain.”<sup>765</sup> Byron, however, had to disguise the gender of the departed, in order to express his love. Thomas Moore, in his *Life of Lord Byron* (1835), while acknowledging his grief for Edlestone, “his adopted brother” was the cause of Byron’s writing the Thyrza poems, insists that it was also heartbreak over Margaret Chaworth, his cousin and youthful love interest, who had married someone else (John Musters in 1805!). “No friendship, however warm,” writes Moore, “could have inspired sorrow so passionate; as no love, however pure, could have kept passion so chastened.”<sup>766</sup> As Louis Crompton points out, Byron referred to Mary Chaworth in ‘Epistle to a Friend’ a poem written on the same day as ‘To Thryza’ “in terms of the greatest bitterness and anger.”<sup>767</sup> Mrs. Musters was also still living, unlike Edlestone, Long (drowned 1809), and Matthews. If he was grieving any woman, it was more likely to be his mother.

### ‘Homodepression’: Melancholy, Sodomy, and Physical Health

George Rousseau suggests the term “homodepression” to describe a “depression where the ‘lowness’ has risen primarily as the result of a same-sex predicament and its social interdictions.”<sup>768</sup> According to this theory, the alienation and isolation experienced by those with sodomitical feelings makes their bodies sick. Lord Hervey suggested to Stephen Fox that his illness in December 1727 was caused by Fox’s absence.<sup>769</sup> The two men left England in January 1728 for fifteen months travel in France and Italy, supposedly for his health, though Lord

---

<sup>765</sup> Thomas Gray, “Sonnet [On the Death of Mr. Richard West]” in *The Poems of Mr. Gray. To Which Are Prefixed Memoirs of His Life and Writings by W. Mason, M.A.* (York: Printed by A. Ward, 1775), 60.

<sup>766</sup> Byron and Moore, *The Works of Lord Byron*, 75.

<sup>767</sup> Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 191.

<sup>768</sup> Rousseau, “Homoplatonic, Homodepressed, Homomorbid,” 27.

<sup>769</sup> John Hervey to Stephen Fox, 28 Dec. 1727, quoted in Halsband, *Lord Hervey*, 75.

Winnington implied to Henry Fox, Stephen's brother, that Hervey's health was largely unchanged by his stay abroad.<sup>770</sup> Hervey himself related his physical health to his erotics, and his amorous life to his having fallen ill, which Rousseau believes to be 'strangely psychosomatic'.<sup>771</sup> Of the many men that Rousseau proposes who may have suffered from homodepression, he includes several of those mentioned in this study: not only Hervey, but also Thomas Gray, Horace Walpole, and William Beckford.<sup>772</sup>

The fact that feelings, as natural to him as breathing, had led to his complete ostracism, and overwhelming loneliness, most certainly contributed to Beckford's troubled mental health. Lady Catherine Hamilton had warned him even before his fall from grace of the need to fight his nature, and to have courage in the struggle.

You have taken the first steps, continue to resist, and every day you will find the struggle less – the *important* struggle – what is it for ? no less than *honour, reputation*, and all that an honest and noble soul holds dear, while infamy, *eternal infamy* (my Soul freezes when I write the word) attends the giving way to the soft alluring of a criminal passion.<sup>773</sup>

Even before his disgrace, thoughts of his beloved were twinned with danger, misery, and death. "How often has my sleep been disturbed by his imaginary cries, how frequently have I seen him approach me, pale and trembling as I lay dozing at Caserta lulled by my dear Lady Hamilton's musick and bathed in tears ... If anything could reconcile me to death it would be the promise of

---

<sup>770</sup> Winnington to Henry Fox, 4 Nov. [1728], quoted in Halsband, 80.

<sup>771</sup> John Hervey Hervey, "An Account of My Own Constitution and Illness ... for the Use of My Children [1731]," in *Some Materials toward Memoirs of the Reign of King George II*, ed. Romney Sedgwick, Reprint of 1931 Edition, vol. 3, 3 vols. (New York: AMS Press, 1970); Rousseau, "Homoplatonic, Homodepressed, Homomorbid," 27, 45n.

<sup>772</sup> Rousseau, "Homoplatonic, Homodepressed, Homomorbid," 30–31.

<sup>773</sup> Lady Catherine Hamilton to William Beckford, [late 1780] in the *Hamilton Papers*, quoted in Chapman, *Beckford*, 78.

mingling our last breaths together and sharing the same grave.”<sup>774</sup> In March 1781, Beckford would describe such a dream to another friend, the Countess d’Orsini-Rosenberg,

Yesterday, in my troubled dreams, I thought I saw your Adriatic Sea under a blood-red moon. I saw the porticos of that dark palace, which is only too well known to us, hung with mourning crêpe. The voice of lamentation was heard. I was being called. I ran up. I was about to touch the blond head of ----- when a dagger pierced my heart. I awoke with a piercing cry, bathed in a mortal sweat.<sup>775</sup>

According to Boyd Alexander, this was typical of dreams which plagued Beckford throughout his life: “when he tries to make contact with the beloved object, the sky becomes overcast, the storm breaks, and the object is unattainable; the dream ends on a note of frustration, despair, and guilt. ... His sense of guilt was represented by accusing voices.”<sup>776</sup>

One of the factors which exacerbates homodepression is being unable to share sorrow and grief with others, combined with the omni-present belief that unhappiness and sorrow are punishments for sin. As Lord Byron later observed, “if I could explain at length the *real* causes which have contributed to increase this perhaps *natural* temperament of mine – this Melancholy which hath made me a bye-word – nobody would wonder – but this is impossible without doing much mischief.”<sup>777</sup>

---

<sup>774</sup> Brian Fothergill, *Beckford of Fonthill* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), 99.

<sup>775</sup> William Beckford to Countess Wynne d’Orsini-Rosenberg, 12 March 1781. Quoted in Alexander, *England’s Wealthiest Son*, 77.

<sup>776</sup> Alexander, 48.

<sup>777</sup> George Gordon Byron, *Byron’s Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of All the Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of All Others*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, vol. 9 (London: J. Murray, 1973), 37–38. Discussed in more detail in Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 100–101.

## Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy: The Middling Sorts.

In a survey of the various pleasures and amusements available in the big city, ‘Posidonius’, a regular contributor to *Read’s Weekly Journal*, finished with a reflection on ‘the Ladies’. “It must be likewise own’d to their everlasting Honour,” he observes, “that where-ever they extend their Dominion, they settle and establish Joy, Liberty, and Happiness, and where their Empire does not prevail, the Ground naturally degenerates into Servitude and Misery, Rusticity, Ignorance.” Thinking back to the flush of raids on molly houses of the previous few years, and the highly publicized cases of Isaac Broderick (May 1730)<sup>778</sup>, and Gilbert Laurence (hanged for sodomy in September 1730)<sup>779</sup>, Posidonius is forced to acknowledge that not *all* of Mankind has “at last acknowledge[d]” the sovereignty of women. “... a few Renegado’s from Nature, have rebell’d...” Posidonius posits since that the problem is too ‘insignificant’ for the Ladies to ‘subdue’ these traitors to nature themselves, he suggests (to the men), that “an Act be passed to punish Sodomy both in the Agent and Patient with Castration and perpetual Imprisonment,” as the best means “to root out that infamous and unnatural Vice.”<sup>780</sup>

Posidonius’ letter reflects a trend expressed by the middling sorts throughout the long 18<sup>th</sup> century: the presence of women was associated with happiness and contentment. As will be seen below, sentimentalism, as expressed in 18th-century novels, portrayed women (virtuous,

---

<sup>778</sup> Broderick was a schoolteacher pilloried for sodomitical assault on two of his students. His case is discussed briefly in Chapters 2 and 3, and more explicitly in Chapter 5.

<sup>779</sup> Gilbert Lawrence was a Frenchman, and a gilder by trade. He was convicted of sodomy with his 14-year old apprentice, Paul Oliver, and hanged 7 Oct. 1730, despite the appeal for mercy from the French Ambassador. Cf. *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, August 1730, trial of Gilbert Laurence (t17399728-24); SP 36/20/2 ff.10-12b, TNA.

<sup>780</sup> Posidonius “To the Editor”, *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 17 July 1731.

Christian women of the middling sort), as the inspiration, even the source of happiness and joy. Conversely, their absence (and sodomitical relationships are always constructed in opposition to women) is seen as the cause of misery, of ignorance, and of vice. Sodomy (and by extension, the sodomites who practice it) is extended not only as causing misery, sadness, and destruction in its practitioners, but in the society in which they live. It was for this reason that pity for sodomites was not to be encouraged. Pity (love and sadness combined) was a type of sadness essential in an enlightened society. Pity eased distress, fostered virtue and feeling, and bound giver and recipient together in generosity and gratitude.

### ‘A Virtuous State of Matrimony ... for Producing... High Degrees of Happiness’: Joy and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts.

In 1753 an anonymous writer published an extensive criticism against celibacy, arguing that marriage is the best way to personal, societal, and national happiness.<sup>781</sup> The author sums up his position: “In short, no wise or virtuous person has the prospect of doing so much good in any other way, as by discharging conjugal offices, and raising up a family, to support the interest of the great family of the earth.”<sup>782</sup> Conjugal love is thus “designed to promote private and public happiness”; indulging it, through marriage, fosters “love, friendship, parental regard, kindness, generosity, and benevolence. Curbing it, either through celibacy or “other unnatural affections”, substitutes “indifference, unkindness, selfishness, and ill-will.” These, the author insists, “are the

---

<sup>781</sup> *An Essay on Celibacy*.

<sup>782</sup> *An Essay on Celibacy*, 85.

foundation of all unhappiness.”<sup>783</sup> Celibacy “is often the cause of private and public misery” and at its most comfortable “is vastly inferior to that of marriage.”

The happiness which human creatures are capable of, is undoubtedly lessened and contracted into too narrow bounds by social abstinence, as hereby the beneficial influence and efficacy of its abilities are perverted, or unapplied, which is, in effect, annihilation. All unemployed powers vested in man, are no better than non-entities, as they neither contribute to the good of the individual, nor the public. As absence of heat produces cold, and absence of light causes darkness, so absence of good produces evil, or negative unhappiness. ... A deviation from nature is a deviation from virtue. A deflection from usefulness is a deflection to uselessness, hurtfulness, and misery.<sup>784</sup>

Literary scholars and cultural historians have traced a strong relationship between the emergence of the sentimental novel and the union of heterosexual passion and moral feeling in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, particularly in the context of the reconfiguration of patriarchal power.<sup>785</sup> This was expressed as ‘erotic sentimentalisms’; the logic of which, according to R.F. Brissenden, is one where “the faculty of moral judgment is located in one’s sensibility ... it must ... bear a very close relationship to one’s sexual responsiveness: one’s capacity for love and one’s capacity for

---

<sup>783</sup> *An Essay on Celibacy*, 87.

<sup>784</sup> *An Essay on Celibacy*, 90–91.

<sup>785</sup> This is a vast and complicated historiography. Some notable examples include Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957); Robert F. Brissenden, *Virtue in Distress: Studies in the Novel of Sentiment from Richardson to Sade* (London: Macmillan, 1974); Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*; Jean H. Hagstrum, *Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Terry Eagleton, *The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality, and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982); John Mullan, *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); Thomas Walter Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1992); Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); Michael McKeon, “Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28, no. 3 (1995): 295–322; Markman Ellis, *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel*, *Cambridge Studies in Romanticism* 18 (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Christopher Flint, *Family Fictions: Narrative and Domestic Relations in Britain, 1688-1798* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1998); Shawn L. Maurer, *Proposing Men: Dialectics of Gender and Class in the Eighteenth-Century English Periodical* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1998); King, *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750*; Kelleher, *Making Love. Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*.



virtue both depend on the delicacy of one's sensibility."<sup>786</sup> Brissenden in particular points to Lawrence Sterne's 1768 novel *A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy*; more recently, Claudia L. Johnson identifies Sterne as the origin of "the general tendency of the sentimental tradition to posit heteroerotic love as the basis for (men's) moral behavior."<sup>787</sup> In particular, scholars such as Nancy Armstrong, G.J. Barker-Benfield, Claudia Johnson and Paul Kelleher have highlighted the importance of sentimentalism.<sup>788</sup> Armstrong considers sentimentalism as key to the consolidation of middle-class power through the shaping of desire. Starting in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and moving into the 20<sup>th</sup>, Armstrong shows how narratives of politics and authority were disguised as fictions of courtship and marriage. Barker-Benfield shows how the rise of a discourse of 'sensibility' helped ease vast changes in society, from the reformation of male manners to the revaluation of female subjectivity. Johnson shows how, during the French Revolution and its aftermath, British writers and polemicists considered that "the fate of the nation [was] understood ... to be tied up with the right heterosexual sentiment of its citizens."<sup>789</sup> Paul Kelleher argues that this power was in conjugal relations, rather than heterosexuality on its own; the state of marriage imparted virtue.

As has been seen in Chapter 2, this elision of heterosexuality and virtue was used to justify hatred and violence towards sodomites, particularly by members of the middling ranks. This

---

<sup>786</sup> Brissenden, *Virtue in Distress*, 87–88.

<sup>787</sup> Claudia L. Johnson, *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s: Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*, Women in Culture and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 63.

<sup>788</sup> Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); G. J Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Johnson, *Equivocal Beings*; Kelleher, *Making Love. Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*.

<sup>789</sup> Johnson, *Equivocal Beings*, 11.

narrative, however, was also used to locate happiness in conjugal relationships, particularly if those relationships had the potential of fertility. While marriage to a virtuous woman is the source of men's happiness, for women happiness comes through motherhood. In *Pamela*, Samuel Richardson's heroine takes 'delight' in the "happiness" she has received through her marriage to Mr. B.; and prays that she may "not be useless in [her] Generation", and "multiply" the Blessings she has been given.<sup>790</sup> If the repeated use of the words 'generation' and references to multiplication were not explicit enough, Richardson later remarks that she "made her beloved Spouse happy in a numerous and hopeful Progeny."<sup>791</sup>

Even novelists such as Henry Fielding and Tobias Smollett, whose earthy humour is at such odds with Richardson's piety, serve to support this narrative. As Paul Kelleher observes, the received wisdom of Henry Fielding's place in the literary history of sentimentalism can be seen as being at odds with itself: when compared with Samuel Richardson, "he embodies a worldly, 'masculine' antisentimentalism, which opposes and repudiates the sexually saturated, 'feminine' sentimentalism of Richardson" but when considered on his own terms, Fielding "represents an ethics based on the principles of sociability and 'good nature'."<sup>792</sup> This ethic supports many of the underlying assumptions of sentimentalism while mocking its outward forms. Carl R. Kropf argues that Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* was written as "an affirmation of the joys of heterosexuality as opposed to the general perception among Fielding's contemporaries that

---

<sup>790</sup> Samuel Richardson, *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded*, ed. Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 363.

<sup>791</sup> Richardson, 499.

<sup>792</sup> Kelleher, *Making Love. Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature.*, 173.

increasing effeminacy and homosexuality were pressing social and moral problems.”<sup>793</sup> He does this by appropriating “narrative events usually associated with homosexuality and enlist them in the cause of celebrating heterosexuality.”<sup>794</sup> Tobias Smollett deals with the issue more directly; both *Peregrine Pickle* and *Roderick Random* have explicitly sodomitical characters (which will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5); according to George Haggerty, these scenes, and particularly the disgust and horror they produce, buttress the undeniably physical intimacy of masculine culture and relationships.<sup>795</sup>

Seemingly at odds with this narrative is erotic and pornographic writing, but it too supported this transformative narrative, though in a different fashion. Sexuality was not only heterosexual, but, as Peter Wagner and Karen Harvey have shown, relentlessly fertile; there are countless references to gardens, trees, and flowers.<sup>796</sup> If the sentimental novel united happiness with conjugal love, pornography married joy to penetrative (heterosexual) sex. Joy was a common euphemism for orgasm. *Jouissance*, from the French term signifying both enjoyment and sexual orgasm, is a psychoanalytical concept that has been incorporated into philosophical and literary theory. *Jouissance* is contrasted with pleasure in critical theory:

pleasure is ... the opposite of *jouissance* in that it is seen as a coming to an end, whereas *jouissance* is regarded as limitless. The connection to orgasm is quite ambiguous in this

---

<sup>793</sup> Carl R. Kropf, “A ‘Certain Absence’: ‘Joseph Andrews’ as Affirmation of Heterosexuality,” *Studies in the Novel* 20, no. 1 (1988): 18.

<sup>794</sup> Kropf, 20.

<sup>795</sup> George E Haggerty, “Smollett’s World of Masculine Desire in ‘The Adventures of Roderick Random,’” *The Eighteenth Century* 53, no. 3 (2012): 317–30.

<sup>796</sup> Wagner, *Eros Revived: Erotica of the Enlightenment in England and America*; Harvey, *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century*.

respect because the implication is that jouissance occurs on a higher plane to that of the merely physical; it is an orgasm of the mind or spirit not just the body.<sup>797</sup>

Within the rhetoric of erotic sentimentalism, sex within conjugal love takes on this aspect of jouissance.

In his study of jouissance in the poetry of William Blake, Richard Sha argues that Blake queers this narrative by arguing that, with the emphasis on fertility, women are less able to experience this form of joy than others. Since women, unlike (heterosexual) men, are judged for their use of sexuality, they “can only with difficulty see jouissance as a means to a higher good.”<sup>798</sup> Like women, sodomites were extensively judged for their use of sexuality. In satirical depictions of sodomites, such as the effeminate fops in drama or elite sodomites in the masculine novels of Tobias Smollett and William Goodall, the sodomite is ineffectual, emasculated, forced to wallow in sensual pleasures because they are denied true happiness.<sup>799</sup> In pornographic novels such as *Fanny Hill*, scenes of heterosexual pleasure are filled with words such as “extasy” (55), “bliss” (130), “rapture” (193), “delight” (199), and “satisfaction” (264); even during Fanny’s first sexual experience, which causes her extreme pain, she “submit[s] joyfully” (70) and later considers her lover the “absolute disposer of [her] happiness” (72). Even with her long career as a prostitute, Fanny’s tale ends with marriage and motherhood. The sodomitical lovers she observes through a

---

<sup>797</sup> Ian Buchanan, “Jouissance” in *A Dictionary of Critical Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

<sup>798</sup> Richard C. Sha, “Blake and the Queering of Jouissance,” in *Queer Blake*, ed. Helen P. Bruder and Tristanne Connolly (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 44.

<sup>799</sup> For some examples of the unhappiness of the fop, cf. McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire*; Haggerty, *Men in Love*, Chap. 2. For Goodall, see Chapter 1, and for Smollett, see Chapter 5.

peephole, however, experience a sexual pleasure that is labelled as “preposterous” “criminal” and “odious”.<sup>800</sup>

### ‘Our Pity is Limited to Natural Sins’: Sadness and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

After the Baptist preacher Rev. John Church was convicted of a sodomitical assault upon assistant potter Adam Foreman at Croydon in August of 1817,<sup>801</sup> numerous publishers took advantage of the scandal to publish trial accounts, accounts of Church’s life, copies of letters, as well as digging up past scandals with young men in previous congregations. Church, in his autobiography (written during his time in prison), estimated that “not less than twenty thousand such scandalous pamphlets have been published, and circulated”, and that the “... infamous squibs have been sent to the four winds of heaven, to Wales, Ireland, Scotland, America, the East and West Indies, and to almost every county and village in England, in twopenny, fourpenny, and sixpenny pamphlets...”<sup>802</sup> Church attempted to salvage what he could of his reputation, in an *Appeal to the Candid Public* (unfortunately lost); in his reply, Rev. Thomas Latham denies Church’s charges of cruelty and bearing false witness, and posits that, in spreading the news about Church’s behaviour with men, he (and other writers and publishers), “have fulfilled our

---

<sup>800</sup> Cleland, *The Memoirs of Fanny Hill*.

<sup>801</sup> The transcript of the trial is printed in Ian McCormick, ed., “The Trial and Conviction of John Church (1817),” in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850: Sodomy* (London: Routledge, 2000), 281–346; *The Trial and Conviction of That Infamous Hypocrite John Church ... For an Abominable Offence ... Tried before Lord Ellenborough, at the Surrey Assizes, Croydon, Saturday, August 16, 1817*, Fifth Edition (London: John Fairburn, 1817).

<sup>802</sup> Church, *The Foundling; or, the Child of Providence*, v.

duty to man (doubtless to women)”, and are content.<sup>803</sup> Lest he be accused of rejoicing in another’s downfall, Latham observes that,

We commiserate ‘poor human nature,’ quite as deeply as the reverend Mr. Church, but, then, our pity is limited to natural sins. Offenses of another description we confess we cannot consent to tolerate. This avowal may seem somewhat harsh to such persons as the Reverend John Church, but we cannot help making it.<sup>804</sup>

In this, the Rev. Mr. Latham is expressing a common sentiment, one that grew stronger over the course of the century: pity is not to be expressed for any person’s suffering, but reserved instead for virtuous persons, whose misfortune is unwarranted, undeserved. In having committed criminal acts, in having a long history of unnatural affections, Church had forfeited his right to pity.

**‘...the Sodomite Alone had No Defence’: Sodomy and the Forfeiture of Compassion.**

**At the Pillory and Gallows.**

This distinction was seen at both the pillory and the gallows. As will be seen in Chapter 5, the purpose of the pillory was to shame the criminal into future good behavior; instead, when given the encouragement and the opportunity, as seen in Chapter 2, the crowd far more frequently turned the pillory into a site of violent hatred. And while this violence at the pillory was not unique to cases of sodomy,<sup>805</sup> cases of sodomitical practices frequently enflamed the passions of

---

<sup>803</sup> Thomas Latham, *The Rod in Pickle; Or, an Answer to the Appeal of John Church ... Containing an Authentic Narrative of the Cause of His Leaving Banbury ... to Which Are Added His Letters Written to the Managers of the Banbury Meeting-House, Etc* (London: Hay & Turner, 1817), 5–6.

<sup>804</sup> Latham, 6.

<sup>805</sup> Shoemaker, *The London Mob*, Chap. 4.

anger and hatred. Robert Shoemaker argues that, by the 1820s, when the changing urban conditions of the metropolis and greater policing of the pillory meant that violent reactions were much reduced, certain crimes, of which sodomitical crimes were a chief example, were still scenes of anger.<sup>806</sup> The role of the crowd in enforcing traditional values can be seen when the treatment of sodomites is contrasted with other cases, such as that of London clergyman William Rowlands. In 1729, Rowlands was convicted of libel after he published a pamphlet directed to several justices of the King's Bench, suggesting that they had acquitted sodomites either for money or, more seriously, because they did not consider it a grievous sin.<sup>807</sup> At the trial, the justices worked hard to clear themselves of this aspersion, proving that of the sodomites they tried, three were hanged and four pilloried; Rowland was duly convicted of libel. When he was pilloried, the crowd cheered and took up a collection for him.<sup>808</sup> Of the hundreds of cases surveyed in this project, the only reference to public pity for a convicted sodomite was 21-year-old Timothy Raven, hanged for sodomy at Lincoln in 1754. He was unable to read or write, and the crowd believed that the true fault in the case lay with his seducer, a Dr. Walton, who had absconded. This pity, which, according to a letter in the *Manchester Mercury*, was felt by the whole crowd gathered to watch the execution, seems to have consisted of cursing the Doctor, and “wishing he might some time or other meet with his deserved punishment.”<sup>809</sup> The writer of the

---

<sup>806</sup> Shoemaker, 106–10.

<sup>807</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1729, trial of William Rowland (t17290709-23). Further details can be found in the *Ipswich Journal*, 12 July 1729 and *Caledonian Mercury*, 17 July 1729.

<sup>808</sup> *Monthly Chronicle* August 1729; *London Journal*, 9 Aug. 1729; *Caledonian Mercury*, 11 Aug. 1729.

<sup>809</sup> *Harrop's Manchester Mercury*, 10 Sept. 1754.

letter immediately undercuts this pity by calling Raven the “Baron of Gomorrah’s disconsolate Lady”, and giving a satirical address in London to which Dr. Walton was rumoured to have fled.

### From the Public and the Bench.

Pity was generally explicitly denied to sodomites. A contributor named ‘Toms’ observed in the *Weekly Journal* that men guilty of sodomy were not only unlamented at their deaths, but should not expect either pity or compassion.<sup>810</sup> Jonathan Green, one of the witnesses against Richard Manning and John Davis, testified that Davis pleaded with him to get the landlady to let them go. Mr. Green refused, and told Davis his reasons: “said I, Friend, if you had brought a girl into the house, I would have interceded for you both to go; but as it is, let the law take its place, for I will have nothing to do with you. ... I said, it was a pity the thing had fell out so, that it was a wicked thing, and I would not screen him in it.”<sup>811</sup> ‘An Admirer of the Fair Sex’, writing in protest of the expected pardon of Captain Jones, declared that, unlike the thief pleading poverty, the rapist and the murderer pleading the strength of their passions, the sodomite alone had no defense, and should never receive the least pity or indulgence.<sup>812</sup>

### From the King.

While pity from the public could not be expected, and pity from magistrates was called encouragement, the King, whose role was to soften justice with mercy, could pardon convicted sodomites with little public outcry. In the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, even the royal mercy

---

<sup>810</sup> *Weekly Journal*, 7 May 1726. From the date, it is clear he is referring to the executions of Lawrence, Wright and Griffin, discussed below.

<sup>811</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, January 1745, trial of Richard Manning John Davis (t17450116-17).

<sup>812</sup> ‘An Admirer of the Fair Sex’, “To the Right Hon. Henry Seymour Conway”, *London Evening Post*, 1 Aug. 1772.



was subject to criticism. In 1772, when George III commuted the sentence Robert Jones to transportation for life: the papers were willing to publicly speak against the King's mercy. Contributors to various papers cast doubt on George's reputation as a pious man – pointing out that the King of France had a right to the title “Most Christian King”, since he had burned sodomites to death in Paris.<sup>813</sup> Others argued that, in pardoning Jones, the King was in contempt of not only the laws of the nation, but of God's laws – and thus was ‘wanting the purity of a pious heathen.’<sup>814</sup> ‘Seneca’, writing in the *London Evening Post* in January 1773, while describing the use of royal pardon as among the noblest duties of a Christian king, decried the irony that, “in doing so, [he] has wantonly destroyed the principles of natural justice.”<sup>815</sup> Others were more bold. Another contributor to the *London Evening Post* hinted at outright rebellion if Jones was pardoned,<sup>816</sup> and the *General Evening Post* reported that pulpits in the city accused the King of violating his coronation oath by respiting Lt. Jones.<sup>817</sup> One clergyman observed that in so doing the King was “denying justice to the nation, under cloak of mercy to the individual.”<sup>818</sup>

---

<sup>813</sup> *Bingley's London Journal*, 10-17 Oct. 1772.

<sup>814</sup> *Middlesex Journal*, 8-10 Sept. 1772.

<sup>815</sup> *London Evening Post*, 9-12 Jan. 1773.

<sup>816</sup> “... his Majesty will risk something more than the affection of his subjects, in pardoning this convicted sodomite” ‘An Admirer of the Fair Sex’, *London Evening Post*, 1 Aug. 1772.

<sup>817</sup> *General Evening Post*, 3-5 Sept. 1772.

<sup>818</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 25 Aug. 1772.

## ‘...My Dear Mother and Family (...Unconscious of my Woe)’: Pity and the Family

While public discourse forbade any sympathy for sodomites, sympathy for their family was permitted. This was sometimes cited as the reason for milder punishments, although this became less common later in the century. In 1721, a man identified only as a ‘young spark’ and a ‘molly’ was spared corporal punishment for his assault on a lawyer’s clerk, out of respect for his family.<sup>819</sup> Nearly a century later, in 1816, the pleas of midshipman Christopher Beauchamp pleaded for the Court Martial Board to spare the pain to his “dear Mother and Family (who ... are yet unconscious of my woe) as well as my Relatives and Friends,”<sup>820</sup> and his co-defendant, midshipman James Bruce urged them to consider that “a respectable Father and Family at a great distance in Fifeshire, Scotland unknowing my sad dilemma will have to suffer the piercing of many sorrows when the Tale is told to them,”<sup>821</sup> fell on deaf ears. They were spared being hanged from the gallows due to the deficiency of the evidence, but suffered several years’ solitary confinement in Marshalsea Prison, and the ignominious end of burgeoning naval careers. A mob of over two thousand people followed the hearse of executed sodomite Joseph Charlton four miles to his gravesite at Tynemouth Priory, but “out of respect to the deceased’s relatives, retired peacefully.”<sup>822</sup> While the newspapers do not explain why so many people followed the

---

<sup>819</sup> *Applebee’s Original Weekly Journal*, 29 April 1721. He was fined £10, and severely reprimanded.

<sup>820</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Defence of Christopher Beauchamp, Beauchamp/Bruce Court Martial, 6-15 January 1816), TNA.

<sup>821</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Defence of James Bruce, Beauchamp/Bruce Court Martial, 6-15 January 1816), TNA.

<sup>822</sup> *Newcastle Courant*, 17 April 1819.

body, they state that some of the crowd were affected by the grief of the family ‘on the melancholy situation’.

Pity expressed for sodomites, unlike perpetrators of any other crime, was portrayed as an endorsement of the act; it was tantamount to calling down the fires of Heaven, of inviting God’s vengeance. Rev. Church, considering his own case, derided this as false religion: the trouble and expense that had been taken to circulate his “supposed infamy” could have been spent “either to save their own souls from hell, or relieve an afflicted person.” Instead, pamphlets exposing his sin were spread by those who made “a profession of religion, and assign the same hypocritical reason for their opposition to me, which the heathens did of old, ... we offend not, because they have sinned against the Lord.”<sup>823</sup>

### Joy, Sadness, and Sodomy: The Poor.

On a Sunday night in February 1725/6, a group of watchmen, informed by several members of the Society for the Reformation of Manners, burst into the house of a woman called Margaret ‘Mother’ Clap in Field Lane, Holborn. Her house, tucked away between an arch and the Bunch of Grapes tavern, was easily blocked off, to prevent escape; and by the early hours of the morning the rooms had been cleared of 40 sodomites, who were rounded up and taken to Newgate to await their trial. According to Thomas Newton, a prostitute and regular frequenter of the house, Mrs. Clap hosted as many as 30 or 40 men a night, more on Sundays.<sup>824</sup> Mother Clap’s is described as a merry, joyful place. Samuel Stevens deposed at her trial that she

---

<sup>823</sup> John Church to Mrs. E----r, Oct. 20, 1818. Printed in Church, *The Voice of Faith in the Valley of Achor*.

<sup>824</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1726, trial of Gabriel Lawrence (t17260420-64).

regularly fetched alcohol for them, and provided a safe space and willing ear.<sup>825</sup> Among the activities at her house were dancing, ‘marrying’, and even a fiddler.

As a result of the raid on Mother Clap’s, Gabriel Lawrence, a 43-year-old milkman; William Griffin, also 43, an upholsterer and father of two; and Thomas Wright, a 32 year-old wool-comber, were hanged May 9<sup>th</sup>, 1726, at Tyburn. While under Sentence of Death at Newgate, they were “instructed in the principles of our Holy Christian Religion,” and on “the Villany and Uncleaness of unnatural Sins, which ought not to be nam’d ... among Christians who profess the true Religion.” The Ordinary “show’d them the Evil of this Sin from God’s visible Judgments inflicted on Sodom and Gomorrah, ... in raining Fire and Brimstone from Heaven upon them...”<sup>826</sup> William Griffin begged that the world would not punish his children, a girl and boy, with his death, and took part in worship and took communion with the rest. Thomas Wright, an Anabaptist, “died in the Christian Faith, a Protestant, believing to be sav’d through the merits of Jesus Christ.” Lawrence, a Roman Catholic, though he joined in services at the Chapel was denied final absolution from the Protestant chaplain, after refusing to renounce his faith.

### ‘For the Further Promotion of their Unbecoming Mirth’: Joy and Sodomy among the Poor.

In 1708, comedic writer Ned Ward published his account of the ‘clubs’ of London, which was reprinted frequently over the next few years. Everything about the book, from its dedicatory epistle to Lucifer, to the names of the clubs themselves (such as the No-nose club), is designed to

---

<sup>825</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1726, trial of Margaret Clap (t17260711-54).

<sup>826</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, Ordinary of Newgate’s Account, May 1726 (OA17260509).

evoke laughter and mirth. Among the clubs surveyed is the Mollies' club: and Ward describes the mollies' past-times for the amusement of the reading public. They mimic female voices, take on women's names; they gossip, and "fall into all the impertinent Tittle Tattle, that a merry Society of good Wives can be subject to, when they have laid aside their Modesty for the Delights of the Bottle." He also describes what he calls 'Festival Nights', in which one of the sodomites, puts a cushion under his clothes, and plays the part of a pregnant woman. He then gives birth to a jointed baby, and "the wooden off-spring" is afterwards "Christen'd, and the holy Sacrament of Baptism to be impudently Profan'd, for the Diversion of the Profligates."<sup>827</sup>

The mollies go on to gossip over tea, complaining about naughty children, drunken husbands, or, (in the case of one molly playing an elderly widow), no husbands at all. They discuss whom the wooden child most resembles, and plan for the 'child's' future career.<sup>828</sup> Like at Mother Clap's, Jonathan Wild describes a house in Holborn where there is dancing.<sup>829</sup> James Dalton, writing two years after the raid on Mother Clap's, also describes mock-births, not only of a jointed baby, but even more ridiculous items: Aunt May, an Upholsterer in the Borough, in love with Mrs. Girl of Redriff, gave birth to a "Pair of Bellows," and Aunt Gear was "brought to Bed of a Cheshire cheese" with "Madam Blackwell and Aunt England standing Gossips."<sup>830</sup> Prominent in these

---

<sup>827</sup> Edward Ward, *Satyrical Reflections on Clubs: In Xxix Chapters*. (London: Printed for J. Phillips, 1710), 285.

<sup>828</sup> Edward Ward, *The Second Part, of the London Clubs* (London: printed by J. Dutton, near Fleet-Street, 1709), 284–88.

<sup>829</sup> Jonathan Wild, *An Answer to A Late Insolent Libel* (London: Printed for Tho. Warner, at the Black-Boy in Paternoster-Row, 1718), 30–31.

<sup>830</sup> Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative*, 40.

accounts is their mirth; they are a “merry society”,<sup>831</sup> with ‘much Joy express’d.’<sup>832</sup> Allusions to such games can be found in satirical documents even in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> and into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. William Jackson, in his excoriation of Samuel Foote, speaks of sodomites enjoying “Little Sports / Unrival’d in Chinese or Turkish Courts”. These little sports are described as “their Christ’nings, Lyings-in, Abortions;” and “Caudle-makings...”<sup>833</sup>

Robert Holloway speaks of a raid on a house in Clement’s-lane, London, which had occurred sometime in the mid-1780s, in which the participants “were seized in the very act of giving caudle to *their lying-in women*, and the new-born infants personated by large dolls!”<sup>834</sup> From information from the landlord, James Cook, Holloway reports that weddings were held at the White Swan in Vere Street in 1810; like those described by Dalton 90 years earlier, the marriage is solemnized with bridesmaids in attendance.<sup>835</sup> If a later report is to be believed, they may even have included a minister.<sup>836</sup>

### Sodomy, Laughter, and Superiority.

Scholar Frank Buckley identifies four conditions for genuine, adult laughter. The first is superiority – laughter is always at the expense of someone or something. Superiority itself is not

---

<sup>831</sup> Ward, *Satirical Reflections on Clubs*, 285.

<sup>832</sup> Ward, 286.

<sup>833</sup> William Jackson, *Sodom and Onan: A Satire Inscrib’d to Foote, Esq. Alias the Devil upon Two Sticks*. (London: Printed for the Author, 1772), 15.

<sup>834</sup> Holloway, “The Phoenix of Sodom, Or, The Vere Street Coterie [1813],” 195. The raid supposedly occurred “about the same period”, as the discovery of a sodomitical society in Exeter “about five and twenty years ago”. I can find no mention of either of these instances in the public papers from the period, so it is possible they are fictitious, or greatly exaggerated.

<sup>835</sup> Holloway, 188.

<sup>836</sup> McCormick, “The Infamous Life of John Church,” 260–61.

enough to produce laughter, “laughter must arise in a *social* context” “it must be occasioned by *surprise*” and “it requires a lightness or *playfulness of spirit*.”<sup>837</sup> The superiority aspect is quite clear: in the satirical accounts of molly houses, such as those by Ward, Wild and Dalton, the sodomites themselves are the butt of the joke, and the reading public the one intended to laugh. – Within that context, the mollies themselves are portrayed as making themselves superior to women, and to traditional values via mockery of the touchstones of courting, marriage, childbirth, and baptism. The molly-houses themselves, as public places, are clearly social in nature; but even in encounters not in any way associated with them, there is always a social aspect. The activities at the molly houses, as will be seen below, can also be considered as containing an element of surprise. The final aspect, lightness or playfulness of spirit, is readily apparent from the description of the activities – it bleeds through even the most hostile of accounts.

The first element, that of superiority, can be found in the reasons put forward to explain these strange rituals. These reasons reveal two different sources of superiority: that of the reading public over the mollies, and that of the mollies over women and the dominant traditions of their society. Ward gives several explanations of the mollies’ behavior, which largely contradict each other: they have “degenerated” from manly behavior, and consider themselves to be women;<sup>838</sup> they do so to attract each other into committing sodomy;<sup>839</sup> to make fun of women, in order to

---

<sup>837</sup> F. H. Buckley, *The Morality of Laughter* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 17.

<sup>838</sup> Ward, *Satirical Reflections on Clubs*, 284.

<sup>839</sup> Ward, 284.

“extinguish that Natural Affection which is due to the Fair Sex, and to turn their Juvenile Desires towards preternatural Polutions [sic].”<sup>840</sup> James Cook, the landlord of the White Swan in Vere Street, told James Holloway that many of his customers, when in bed together, would make fun of their wives. He also refers to the sodomitical weddings there as “mockery.”<sup>841</sup> As we saw in Chapter 2, the idea that sodomites hated (and hurt) women was key to justifications for the social abhorrence of sodomy. That chapter also examined friendships between sodomites and women, both elite and poor; and spouses, such as Lady Hervey and Lady Beckford, who supported their husbands’ love-affairs with men.

As with the element of superiority, the social aspect of the mollies’ laughter is also clearly present. Accounts of sodomitical clubs later in the century, which tend to derive more from middling sort clubs rather than the criminal underworld,<sup>842</sup> also highlight social aspects – they describe men as friends, such as Samuel Drybutter and Robert Jones, who likely never met. While these accounts are either satirical, or bordering on conspiracy theory, the sociability of the sodomites is presented as a joke or threat. Outside of the molly-house culture, many sodomitical encounters grew out of the homosocial life of men of the middling and poorer sorts. As Randolph Trumbach points out, the vast majority of cases of sodomitical assault began as normal activities – casual drinking companions, or men sharing a bed at night.<sup>843</sup> John Dicks treated

---

<sup>840</sup> Ward, 288.

<sup>841</sup> Holloway, “The Phoenix of Sodom, Or, The Vere Street Coterie [1813],” 188.

<sup>842</sup> See Chapter 2: Love and Hatred, section 2.4.1 Love, Sodomy and the Middling Sorts.

<sup>843</sup> Trumbach, “Sodomitical Assaults, Gender Role, and Sexual Development in Eighteenth-Century London.”



John Meeson to drinks at several alehouses, until he was so drunk he passed out;<sup>844</sup> the attempt on James Fasset by Richard Branson began by invitations to share a drink;<sup>845</sup> and seaman James Byrne of the HMS *Centaur* attempted to commit sodomy on the body of his shipmate, Simon Burne, after the two shared their grog and curled up in a hammock together.<sup>846</sup> Joseph Churchill frequently hugged, kissed and fondled his fellow apprentice Charles Horn (age 20); Horn refused to let Churchill sleep in their bed after that, and so he was forced to share with two Portuguese sailors who were lodging in their master's house. According to Churchill, one of them, Emmanuel Rosé, buggered him during the night; Churchill told his mother, and so the case came to court.<sup>847</sup>

According to psychologist Donald Nathanson, the affect surprise/startle is fleeting, a biological response functioning to “clear the mental apparatus so that the organism can remove attention from whatever else might have been occupying it and focus on whatever startled it. ... Surprise-startle is the affect involved when we stop someone's world, when we create a situation that requires a fresh start.”<sup>848</sup> For men constantly living in fear and oppression, the sudden removal of that burden by the appearance of something unexpected (such as safety) provides the stimulus for this psychological response. Rictor Norton sees in these mock births more than either an

---

<sup>844</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, April 1722, trial of John Dicks (t17220404-29).

<sup>845</sup> See Chapter 1, Lust and Disgust, for a fuller discussion of this case. Trumbach, “The Trial of Richard Branson.”

<sup>846</sup> ADM 1/5452 (Court Martial of J. Byrne, 1 Nov. 1815), TNA. Byrne was found guilty of the attempt and received two hundred lashes on his bare back.

<sup>847</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, February 1760, trial of Emanuel Roze (t17600227-44).

<sup>848</sup> Donald L. Nathanson, *Shame and Pride: Affect, Sex, and the Birth of the Self* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1992), 88–89.

erotic game or a parody of important milestones in a woman's life: he theorizes that it was an act of imitative magic, designed to repel evil spirits, similar to those practiced by the Mohave Indians, in which transvestite men mimic pregnancy and childbirth. For Norton, these 'lying-ins' serve to "relieve their [the mollies'] collective anxiety through outrageous fun, and what today is called 'camp' behaviour."<sup>849</sup>

Whether the ceremonies were designed to mock women, to appropriate the rituals of conjugal life, or as imitative magic to relieve anxiety resulting from their oppression, they are reported as scenes of great fun and jollity. Playfulness, mirth, and joy dominate the emotional landscape; music, dancing, play-acting; the sudden bursts of laughter, the release of stress, and the sharing of joys serve as a counterweight to the grief and sadness, the shame and loss which follow discovery of their actions.

### 'Never Did I See Such a Picture of Distress': Sadness and Sodomy among the Poor.

On the first of June 1761, William Dillon Sheppard was hanged for sodomy in Bristol. He had just arrived in the city, but was already well known for sodomitical behaviour in London and Bristol.<sup>850</sup> He was convicted for sexually assaulting a boy, aged 9.<sup>851</sup> Before his death, he made

---

<sup>849</sup> Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House*, 98–99. The term 'camp' was not used in this context until 1909. Frederick Park, convicted of homosexual acts in 1870, attested to 'campish undertakings', though he did not explain what these were. *The Times*, 30 May 1870; for the first use of 'camp' in this context, cf. James Redding Ware, *Passing English of the Victorian Era: A Dictionary of Heterodox English, Slang and Phrase* (London: Routledge, 1909), 61.

<sup>850</sup> William Dillon Sheppard, *Some Particulars Relating to the Life of William Dillon Sheppard, Who Was Executed at St. Michael's Hill Gallows, for Sodomy, on Monday the 1st of June, 1761. Published at His Own Request, and by the Authority of the Sherrieff*. (Bristol: Printed and sold by E. Ward, 1761), 3, 10.

<sup>851</sup> Sheppard, 11–12. As has been observed in the Introduction, while we now consider paedophilia as completely different from homosexuality, the 18<sup>th</sup> century had no such legal or cultural distinction.

a full confession, admitting that he had frequently ‘been guilty of very great indecencies, especially when in liquor,’<sup>852</sup> though he went to his grave denying that he had assaulted the boy.

The prison chaplain was witness to Sheppard’s distress at his upcoming death,

Upon his return to prison, the most absolute despair seized his heart. ... Never did I see such a picture of distress. The wildness of his looks, his streaming eyes, and knees smiting one against another, spoke the horrors and distraction of his soul. ... He roar’d for the disquietness of his heart, and in the anguish of his broken spirit would frequently cry... Expressions he utter’d with a wildness and vehemence not to be described. They were frequently interrupted with floods of tears and bitter groans, and with every expression of the most hopeless grief.<sup>853</sup>

Facing the reality of death caused many convicted sodomites a great deal of terror and despair.

Fifteen-year old Thomas Finley, whose case has been discussed in Chapter 1, was “quite out of his mind” with fright in the week between receiving his sentence and being hanged aboard the *Princess Royal*.<sup>854</sup> Samuel Stockton, a whitster from Latchford, Cheshire and the first of the men of Warrington to be hanged, was so terrified at the gallows that his legs were shaking.<sup>855</sup> John Powell, who followed him, was described as being “agitated”, but not as “dejected” as Stockton. Joseph Holland, a fifty-year-old pawnbroker, and the third man hanged for sodomy that day, was the most visibly despairing. The *Lancaster Gazette* reported that “he seemed impressed with all the horrors consequent to a situation so awful, and to implore the pardon of Almighty God with the greatest fervency.” Richard Oakden, hanged at Newgate on 17 November 1809, came dressed in mourning; he seemed “weighed down by the consciousness of the odious nature of his

---

<sup>852</sup> Sheppard, 12–13.

<sup>853</sup> Sheppard, 14–17.

<sup>854</sup> *Lloyd’s Evening Post*, 27–29 July 1761; *London Chronicle*, 28–30 July 1761; *London Evening Post*, 28–30 July 1761; *St. James’ Chronicle (British Evening Post)*, 28–30 July 1761.

<sup>855</sup> *Lancaster Gazette*, 20 Sept. 1806.

offence, he held down his head and never once looked up.”<sup>856</sup> William North’s execution for sodomy in 1823 was “one of the most trying scenes to the clergymen they ever witnessed”, due to the sheer terror expressed by the prisoner; “never appeared a man so unprepared, unresigned to his fate.”<sup>857</sup>

### Sodomy, Madness, and Despair.

Some sodomites, however, refused to follow the emotionology expected for men in their situation; instead of expressing grief and penitence at their fate, or even terror, some appeared completely indifferent to their fate, and even to the seriousness of the crime with which they had been accused. Dana Rabin argues that the criminally insane were frequently compared to animals, because they lacked reason.<sup>858</sup> She discusses the 1756 murder trial of Robert Ogle, who was found not guilty by reason of insanity: proofs of which included his insensibility to the trial, the possibility of being convicted of a capital crime, even the awareness that his action was a crime.<sup>859</sup> As has been seen in Chapter 1, sodomites too were compared to animals; although this was usually due to lack of control over lust, rather than lack of reason.<sup>860</sup> Nevertheless, as Paul Kelleher points out, for much of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, “portraits of male sexual perversity are

---

<sup>856</sup> *Oxford Journal*, 18 Nov. 1809.

<sup>857</sup> *Ipswich Journal*, 1 Mar. 1823.

<sup>858</sup> Dana Y. Rabin, *Identity, Crime, and Legal Responsibility in Eighteenth-Century England* (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 42.

<sup>859</sup> Rabin, 45. The trial transcript can be found at *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, June 1756, trial of Robert Ogle (t17560603-29).

<sup>860</sup> Occasionally, however, the choice of a male partner is seen as a sign of lack of reason – for why would one choose such a partner over a woman? For a discussion of these links, cf. Paul Kelleher, “Reason, Madness, and Sexuality in the British Public Sphere,” *The Eighteenth Century* 53, no. 3 (2012): 291–315.

punctuated by the specters of madness and unreason.”<sup>861</sup> Unlike the insanity of Mr. Ogle, the persistent comparison of sodomitical desire and unreason is not to alleviate their guilt, but the “... affirmation ... of conjugal heterosexuality as the ideal union of reason, sex, and morality.”

Accounts of accused sodomites who are indifferent to their crime, their fate, and the heinousness of their behaviour are sometimes presented as tales of insanity. T. Lothgow, found guilty of assault (and acquitted of sodomitical assault) at Guildhall, November 1798, for which he was sentenced to six months in Newgate, was completely mute at his trial. His friends said that they believed that the stress of being charged with sodomitical assault had driven him insane.<sup>862</sup> As was seen in the previous chapter, Warrington magistrate J. A. Borron was confounded by the indifference with which Isaac Hitchen met his approaching death. He told Earl Spencer that “Reason recoiled at the view of such tranquility with such guilt, ... such faithful attachment to friends at the expence of an ignominious and almost immediate death.”<sup>863</sup> W. Wheeler, executed at Shrewsbury in 1814, did not appear to show either sorrow or penitence.<sup>864</sup>

### Despair, Forgiveness, and Joy.

As will be seen in Chapter 5, the grief and despair from the shame of being publicly identified as sodomites could lead men to suicide. The *Post Angel* attributed the suicide of Mr. Jermaine, the Clerk of St. Dunstan’s, to despair and guilt;<sup>865</sup> in a 1780 debate in the House of Commons, Sir

---

<sup>861</sup> Kelleher, 292.

<sup>862</sup> *Mirror of the Times*, 17 Nov. 1798. This may be a misprint for Lithgow.

<sup>863</sup> J.A. Borron to Earl Spencer, 22 Sept. 1806, BL Add. MS 75900 Vol. dc.

<sup>864</sup> *Lancaster Gazette*, 23 April 1814.

<sup>865</sup> *Post Angel*, March 1701.

Charles Bunbury spoke of a man of Bury, who was thrown into such deep despair on being sentenced to the pillory, that he took poison.<sup>866</sup> For some sodomites, the despair of their situation was ameliorated by the joy of God's forgiveness. An example of this is the change of heart experienced by William Dillon Sheppard prior to his execution in 1761. According to the chaplain, Sheppard on the morning of his death was "quite well and happy, and ready for every thing." He took part in Anglican communion (even though he died a Roman Catholic), and prayed and sang. He took his leave of his fellow prisoners, bidding them to turn to God with all their heart, and preached them a good-bye sermon.

O what grace to such a wretch! How undeserved and free! O let none despair! I have found mercy. Come, my friends, to a GOD in CHRIST, let not your unworthiness keep you back, as it did *me*. Defer not the time. ... Do not presume upon his mercy as I have done. You have now fair warning. O do not make light of it. You see in me a proof that the wicked do not live out half their days; and tho' you may not come to be hang'd, yet by riot, excess, and debauchery, you cut your days short yourselves. The law of God and of Nature condemns you, and you are your own executioners. If you love life therefore and would see good days, *fear God*. You can never be happy but in him. ... I assure you I am now as happy as I was miserable. I am full of comfort. I know God for Christ's sake hath forgiven me all my sins. I am not afraid to meet death or judgment. I am full of happiness, my conversation is in heaven, where I know, blessed be God, I am now going, and I only wish you all the happiness I feel.<sup>867</sup>

This was also experienced by the Rev. John Church. While in prison for sodomitical assault, he was torn between "much grief, anger, rebellion, and discontent," and the hope that he "might be favored with the very gracious visits of the Saviour, and a sense of God's approbation in [his]

---

<sup>866</sup> *General Evening Post*, 11-13 April 1780. This largely matches the fate William Sell the previous summer (see chapter 5); however, Mr. Sell was in Ipswich, not Bury. It is likely to Mr. Sell that Sir Charles Bunbury refers, but may be another man.

<sup>867</sup> Sheppard, *Some Particulars Relating to the Life of William Dillon Sheppard*, 42-44.

own soul, though despised by others.”<sup>868</sup> In his letters from prison, he took on the pseudonym

‘Ruhamah’; the name of the daughter of Hosea, which meant ‘one who has been spared.’<sup>869</sup>

Between bouts of prayer, reading, and writing to members of his congregation, Rev. Church also provided spiritual support for prisoners facing the gallows. He prayed with them, preached to them, and helped to prepare them for their fate. In a touching letter to Miss Davies, he reflected on the death of three men and grieved for their loss. On the day the three were hanged, he woke up early and prayed that the men “might feel the joys of salvation”. While he could not see the procession to the gallows from his cell, nor the execution, he could hear nearly everything. At the sound of “the fatal drop which launched them into the presence of God,” Church burst into tears, and felt his heart break. The rest of the day, grief and sorrow competed with the thought that they might have been saved, and “grief and gratitude took their several turns” in his mind.<sup>870</sup>

Rev. Church was fortunate to have his strong faith to provide some consolation. Church was able to remain strong in his faith due to his theology, which bordered on antinomianism – as one of God’s elect, his sins had no lasting impact on his soul – his actions were predestined, and sins had already been forgiven by means of Christ’s sacrifice. Instead, troubles were sent by God to

---

<sup>868</sup> John Church to Mr. K—g, 10 Aug. 1818. Printed in Church, *The Voice of Faith in the Valley of Achor*. The reference is to Hosea 2:1.

<sup>869</sup> John Church to Mr. K---g, 10 Aug. 1818. Printed in Church.

<sup>870</sup> John Church to Miss Davies, 1 Sept. 1818. Printed in Church. The condemned men had been held at the jail at Horsemonger-lane, as was Church, and had been condemned at the last Guildford Assizes. They were Wm. West (aged 24, passing counterfeit bank notes), Wm. Park (aged 23, burglary) and Wm. Cook (breaking and entering). *Times*, 1 Sept. 1818.

help the faithful purge themselves of pride and rebellion, that they might be partakers in God's holiness.<sup>871</sup> He expressed how his theology affected his feelings in a letter of February 1818:

I cannot bless God for distress of mind, but I can bless him for that grace that melts the heart, and produces that secret sacred mourning, wonder, gratitude, and peace. None but an all-seeing Jehovah can tell what I have seen here; my grief has been great, my sighs have been many, my heart has been broken, sin has appeared detestable, error damnable, man truly depraved, God patient, long suffering and good. I have been deeply distressed on account of my own sins, and the sins of others. O that this work had been as deep on my soul some years ago, as it has been only some few months past, but, alas, I lived too far off from God – ... and I was in doubts what to do between conscience and feelings, guided too much by the latter, and the former got hardened. These and a thousand things more I deeply regret; these try my spirit now, and though I have no doubt they are pardoned, for I have tasted, felt, and handled that blessing also in this place, yet I cannot, will not forgive myself, while I live in the body.<sup>872</sup>

Sorrow, grief, and deepest despair were the expected emotions for sodomites facing death.

Accounts of their final emotions dwell particularly on this aspect, allowing their writers (usually churchmen), to reflect on sorrow and death as the wages of sin, and contrast the sorrow resulting from worldly pleasures with the eternal happiness of those who have dedicated their souls to God. Some sodomites, however, did not follow this expected script; they refused to confess, remained unphased by their trial, conviction, and approaching death. Like the insane, this was a sign of unreason, of madness; even of a lack of humanity. Unlike the insane, however, this did not reduce their culpability, nor make them deserving objects of pity.

---

<sup>871</sup> John Church to Mrs. Lawson, 1 Oct. 1818; John Church to Mrs. E----r, 20 Oct. 1818; John Church to Mr. Edmonds, 12 April 1819. All letters printed in Church.

<sup>872</sup> John Church to Mr. & Mrs. P----n, 20 Feb. 1818. Printed in Church.



## Conclusion.

The cultural shift of the 18<sup>th</sup> century from joy to happiness led most directly to the perception that sodomites were incapable of true happiness. Happiness was tied to virtue, and, through erotic sentimentalism, virtue was tied to domesticity and conjugal love. This ideology merged with the religious belief in that true joy was only available in the next world, and thus out of the reach of the sinful. While sodomy was regarded as sin, rather than part of human nature, the sodomite was doomed to sorrow, despair; excluded from society, from the benefits of love and virtue through marriage and participation in civic life.

As can be seen from the tales of mirth and playfulness, sodomites when they were free from the judgment of their society were still capable of joy. Outside of that environment, however, the ostracism and enforced silence about their feelings could cause great unhappiness, and even psychosomatic illness. Even prior to the pathologization of same-sex eroticism in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, sodomitical desires were already being connected to mental illness, though this was never offered as a defence. William Beckford considered that he could only truly be with Courtenay once they were both dead, and Byron was unable to publicly express his love of Edlestone, even after his death.

## Chapter 5

### Shame and Pride

On July 10, 1810, William Beckford, at his home in Wiltshire, received his copy of the *Morning Chronicle*, and read there the results of the police raid on the White Swan in Vere Street, Clare Market, where “23 persons, including the landlord of the house, were taken into custody.” They were lodged overnight at St. Clement’s Watch-house, before being taken to Bow-Street for examination. By that time, however,

a great concourse of people had collected in Bow-street, and which was much increased by the great mob that followed the prisoners when they were brought from the watch-house. It was with the greatest difficulty the officers could bring them to and from the Brown Bear to the Office; the mob, particularly the women, expressing their detestation of the offence of which the prisoners were charged.<sup>873</sup>

Eleven of the twenty-three men were discharged, on account of there being no evidence of their doing anything other than being together in a room on the first floor of the house. Once released from police custody, they still had to deal with the crowd of people outside the Office, as

the crowd had, by this time, become so great in Bow-street, particularly facing the Office, that it was almost impossible to pass, and most of those who were discharged, were very roughly handled; several of them were hunted about the neighbourhood, and with great difficulty escaped with their lives, although every exertion was used by the constables and patrol to prevent such dangerous proceedings; and, in doing which, many of them were roughly treated.

The shame and danger of the scene affected Beckford, who cut out the article and placed it in his notebook.<sup>874</sup> He spent much time thinking about it over the course of the day, and, writing to

---

<sup>873</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 10 July 1810. The second quotation is from the same article.

<sup>874</sup> Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 37.

Gregorio Franchi the next day, re-envisioned the walk of shame into a procession like those he had seen in Portugal and Spain,

Poor sods – what a fine ordeal, what a procession, what a pilgrimage, what a song and dance, what a rosary. What a pity not to have a balcony in Bow Street to see them pass, and worse still not to have a magic wand to transform into a triumph the sorry sequence of events.<sup>875</sup>

He would re-imagine an even grander procession twelve years later, after the arrest of the Hon. Percy Jocelyn, Bishop of Clogher (uncle of Lord Roden, who was Beckford's friend, and the only member of the aristocracy, other than his family, to visit Fonthill while he was in residence).<sup>876</sup> Jocelyn's walk, with his pants round his knees, still in his clerical collar, to the Marlborough Police office, included vast crowds shouting, 'Look at the Bishop, look at the Bishop!'. Beckford, writing to his friend Abbé Macquin from Bath, asked him for his thoughts on the "... the St. Albans Street Procession without cross or banner but with its sadly beautiful white drapery, whilst the *Ecce Sacerdos! Ecce Sacerdos!* resounded through the neighbourhood..."<sup>877</sup>

---

<sup>875</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 11 July 1810. Printed in Beckford, 92. It is not clear what kind of procession Beckford is referring to here – it could be one of the Catholic saint day festivals, but could also be the *auto de fé*, which continued till 1821. According to David Higgs, while Portuguese sodomy cases were rarely prosecuted by the Inquisitorial officials unless they involved child abuse or acts committed by priests or monks, several sodomites were investigated by the Inquisition in the 1780s and 1790s, when Beckford was resident. Cf. David Higgs, "Lisbon," in *Queer Sites: Gay Urban Histories since 1600*, ed. David Higgs (London: Routledge, 1999), 112–37.

<sup>876</sup> Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*, 248 n.2. Lord Roden, while not a family member, was still connected to Beckford through family – his second wife was the sister of Beckford's son-in-law, General James Orde. He visited Beckford with Orde in October 1818, after the death of Beckford's daughter Margaret.

<sup>877</sup> William Beckford to Abbé Denis Macquin, 7 Aug. 1822, printed in Beckford, 337. According to Boyd Alexander, *Ecce Sacerdos* is from the Roman Service for the Reception of a New Bishop in his Cathedral, and in the Mass of Confessor Pontiffs. The full phrase is *Ecce sacerdos magnus, qui in diebus suis placuit Deo et inventus est justus* (Behold the great High Priest, who in his days pleased God and was found righteous).

This chapter shall consider moral and intellectual understandings of shame and pride between 1691 and 1828, and how these played out in contemporary discussions of sodomy and sodomites. First, it will consider how pride and shame have been understood by previous historians. Then, it will consider how they were understood by contemporary thinkers, and then will look closely at how shame and pride played out in accounts of sodomy and sodomites.

## Shame, Pride and the Academy

Surprisingly, both pride and shame as emotions have been understudied by historians. While pride as an aspect of identity formation has been the subject of numerous historical discussions,<sup>878</sup> the focus of these discussions is usually the identity being formed, not pride as an emotion. Different aspects of pride have been studied to varying degrees. Historians of philosophy and moral ideas have considered pride in the greatest depth. Philosopher and intellectual historian Arthur O. Lovejoy, one of the earliest scholars of the history of ideas, wrote extensively about pride in early modern and 18<sup>th</sup>-century thought over his long career (1920s – early 1960s), looking at the writings of philosophers, satirists, and theologians. Lovejoy was particularly interested in pride in its socio-political context, and so looked at its transformation

---

<sup>878</sup> Such studies tend to focus on national, ethnic or civic pride, or the role of memory and commemoration in the formation of these. While there are too many of these to name them all, some recent examples include: James A. Baer, “God and the Nation: Protestants, Patriotism and Pride in Cuba, 1890–1906,” *International Journal of Cuban Studies* 8, no. 1 (2016): 74–96; Steve Poole, “‘Bringing Great Shame upon This City’: Sodomy, the Courts and the Civic Idiom in Eighteenth-Century Bristol,” *Urban History* 34, no. 1 (2007): 114–26, doi:10.1017/S0963926807004385; Caroline E. Light, *That Pride of Race and Character: The Roots of Jewish Benevolence in the Jim Crow South* (New York: New York University Press, 2014).

from religious vice to secular virtue.<sup>879</sup> Most of the study of pride as an idea has been done by historical philosophers, particularly those who study Mandeville and Hume.<sup>880</sup>

Elias saw shame as central to his ‘civilizing process’ – as physical punishments decreased, shame became the dominant form of social control, but even as it became more prevalent, shame became invisible in modern societies, due to taboos on the subjects deemed most shameful. In this way, Elias makes explicit the connection between psychological reactions (shame and repugnance), and social dynamics (manners, refinement, and civilization).<sup>881</sup> Although, as will be seen below, shame was a key part of the physical punishments (the pillory, whipping, etc); these punishments were part of how shame was transmitted and internalized.

Social historians have studied the ways shame has interacted with the body, with sexual behavior, and with social exclusion and in the aftermath of war.<sup>882</sup> Shame as a concept has not been as well studied by historical philosophers (or historians of ideas), though William Stafford has provided an important essay on shame’s companion virtues, modesty and humility, and Farid

---

<sup>879</sup> Lovejoy develops these ideas over several articles and books. Cf. Arthur O. Lovejoy, “‘Pride’ in Eighteenth-Century Thought,” *Modern Language Notes* 36, no. 1 (1921): 31–37; Arthur O. Lovejoy, *Essays in the History of Ideas* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1948); Arthur O. Lovejoy, *Reflections on Human Nature* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1961).

<sup>880</sup> For Pride in Mandeville: M. M. Goldsmith, “Public Virtue and Private Vices: Bernard Mandeville and English Political Ideologies in the Early Eighteenth Century,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 9, no. 4 (1976): 477–510; Laurence Dickey, “Pride, Hypocrisy & Civility in Mandeville’s Social and Historical Theory,” *Critical Review* 4, no. 3 (Summer 1990): 387–431; Daniel Luban, “Bernard Mandeville as Moralizer and Materialist,” *History of European Ideas* 41, no. 7 (2015): 831–57, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2015.1010777>. For Pride in Hume: Robert A. Manzer, “Hume on Pride and Love of Fame,” *Polity* 28, no. 3 (1996): 333–55; Andrew Sabl, “Noble Infirmary: Love of Fame in Hume,” *Political Theory* 34, no. 5 (2006): 542–68; Jacqueline Taylor, “Hume on the Dignity of Pride,” *Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 10, no. 1 (2012): 29–49, <https://doi.org/10.3366/jsp.2012.0026>. For Smith: Maria Elton, “Self-Love in Adam Smith and the Stoic Oikeiosis,” *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought* 32, no. 1 (May 5, 2015): 191–212, <https://doi.org/10.1163/20512996-12340043>.

<sup>881</sup> Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, 1st American ed, Mole Editions (New York: Urizen Books, 1978), 160.

<sup>882</sup> Nash and Kilday, *Cultures of Shame*, 8. Nash and Kilday provide an excellent historiography of shame in the early modern period.

Azfar has studied how fears about urban shame contributed to concern about the mollies in the 1720s.<sup>883</sup> Another key strain is in the history of crime; where shame is frequently mentioned as a key factor in the underreporting of crime (particularly sex crimes). As well, studies of community-based shaming rituals and state-based corporal punishments have shown how societies can use shame to regulate social behavior.<sup>884</sup>

David Nash and Anne-Marie Kildare's book, *Cultures of Shame*, has made an important first step to examining how shame operated within early modern British culture: how it interacted with moral discourses of the period, the degree to which authorities tried to control shame-based opprobrium, and the degree to which people suffering from shame could manipulate their notoriety to their own purposes.<sup>885</sup>

## Shame and Pride in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century Thought

In 18<sup>th</sup>-century dictionaries,<sup>886</sup> shame is most commonly associated with disgrace, dishonor, and consciousness of having done something wrong; but is also associated with bashfulness, modesty, and being humble (this can be both a negative and a positive, depending on context). Modesty is a virtue – but only when ‘natural’ (otherwise it is prudery), and in the properly

---

<sup>883</sup> William Stafford, “Concepts of Modesty and Humility in Eighteenth-Century British Discourses,” *Enlightenment and Dissent* 29 (September 2014): 42–78. ; Azfar, “Beastly Sodomites and the Shameless Urban Future.”

<sup>884</sup> Nash and Kildare, *Cultures of Shame*, 9.

<sup>885</sup> Nash and Kildare, 21–27.

<sup>886</sup> Kersey, *A New English Dictionary*, 1702; Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*; Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* [1755]; Francis Allen, *A Complete English Dictionary: Containing an Explanation of All the Words Made Use of in the Common Occurrences of Life, or in the Several Arts and Sciences* (London: Printed for J. Wilson and J. Fell, 1765); Ash, *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*; John Wesley, *The Complete English Dictionary: Explaining Most of Those Hard Words, Which Are Found in the Best English Writers.*, The third edition (London: Printed by R. Hawes, 1777); Barclay, *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*, 1792.

gendered/aged body.<sup>887</sup> For adult men, modesty and humility is excluded from definitions of virtue, and can be derided as meanness or cowardice.<sup>888</sup> Pride, on the other hand, is mainly negative – it is associated with haughtiness, vanity, arrogance, with being puffed up, having too high an opinion of oneself. It is occasionally associated with dignity and beauty, but these associations are rare, and as with concepts of modesty and humility, are highly dependent on gender, age, and social position.<sup>889</sup>

Shame is a very social emotion. The nature of shame was one of great interest to philosophers, moralists and social commentators of all stripes in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. Did it occur naturally, or could it be compelled by society and punishment? Shaftesbury argued that it could not be compelled, that “the greatest danger in the world can never breed shame; nor can the opinion of the world compel us to it... we can never truly blush for anything beside what we think truly shameful...”<sup>890</sup> Whether natural, or compelled, shame was essential to the moral nation. Edmund Gibson, the Bishop of London, committed enemy of masquerades and molly houses, observed that it was “...*Shame* which keeps multitudes of Sinners within the bounds of *Decency*.”<sup>891</sup>

---

<sup>887</sup> As William Stafford points out, following Ruth Yeazell, modesty is only a virtue in women and young men. For adult men, it is an extremely problematic quality. Cf. Stafford, “Concepts of Modesty and Humility in Eighteenth-Century British Discourses,” 61–62, and Ruth Bernard Yeazell, *Fictions of Modesty: Women and Courtship in the English Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 9.

<sup>888</sup> Stafford, “Concepts of Modesty and Humility in Eighteenth-Century British Discourses,” 62. Stafford cites examples from the *Tatler*, the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Adam Ferguson and Samuel Johnson.

<sup>889</sup> McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire*, 42–49. Here, McFarlane is specifically discussing the inversion of masculinity/effeminacy in regards to sodomites – however, he makes a very important point – the qualities of vanity and arrogance are usually only considered effeminate in the bodies of young, lower-class individuals.

<sup>890</sup> Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* [1711], 2:139.

<sup>891</sup> Edmund Gibson, *A Sermon Preached Before the Society for the Reformation of Manners ...*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. (London: J. Wyat, 1725): 19.

The companionate virtues of shame were modesty and humility. Humility was an integral part of Christian life. William Law, in his influential *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, considers humility to be essential to piety.<sup>892</sup> Of course, true humility was extremely difficult (if not impossible) to achieve. As Jennifer Herdt points out, for 17<sup>th</sup>-century Puritan writers, “the theme of honesty comes [with] a theme of hypocrisy. ... Sincere conviction of sin is a sign of election; rhetorical exaggeration, on the other hand, would be a sign of hubris, a refusal of the dependency of grace.”<sup>893</sup> This hypocrisy was the subject of frequent satire.<sup>894</sup> For Bernard Mandeville, shame was neither good nor bad, but was the cause of good or bad actions: Shame “may hinder a prostitute from yielding to a Man before Company, and the same Shame may cause a Bashful good natur’d Creature, ... overcome by frailty, to make way with her infant.”<sup>895</sup>

By the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, scholars had moved from modesty towards decency as the primary companionate virtue of shame. David Hume expressed reservations about the virtue of modesty. “It is necessary ... to know our rank and station in the world, whether it be fixed by our birth, fortune, employments, talents, or reputation. It is necessary to feel the sentiment and passion of pride in conformity to it, and to regulate our actions accordingly.”<sup>896</sup> Hume argued that decency, modesty and humility, expressed through good manners, allow society to live with

---

<sup>892</sup> William Law, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (London: Printed for William Innys, 1729), 148–49.

<sup>893</sup> Jennifer A. Herdt, *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 211.

<sup>894</sup> For example, see Edward Young, *Love of Fame, the Universal Passion*. ([London: s.n.]: Printed in the year MDCCLIII, 1753), 26–27.

<sup>895</sup> Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: Or Private Vices, Public Benefits.*, 2nd Edition (London: Printed for Edmund Parker, 1723), 46.

<sup>896</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 599.



the contradictions between virtue and self-interest.<sup>897</sup> In Hume's estimation, if they are properly disguised, self-love and vanity were essential to moral behaviour, and worked to ensure the smooth functioning of society.

By mid-century, there was an increasing awareness that shame had become internalized, and (in suitably feeling individuals), no longer required much external reinforcement. According to Adam Smith, true shame was an internal process. Even,

if what he had been guilty of was not merely one of those improprieties which are the objects of simple disapprobation, but one of those enormous crimes which excite detestation and resentment, he could never think of it as long as he had any sensibility left, without feeling all the agony of horror and remorse; and though he could be assured that no man was ever to know it, and could even bring himself to believe that there was no God to revenge it, ... he would still regard himself as the natural object of the hatred and indignation of all his fellow-creatures; and if his heart was not grown callous by the habit of crimes, he could not think without terror and astonishment even of the manner in which mankind would look upon him, of what would be the expression of their countenance and of their eyes, if the dreadful truth should ever come to be known.<sup>898</sup>

Thinkers throughout the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century came to similar conclusions. Alexander Forbes, in his *Discourse on Decency* (1762), observes the close relationship between shame and decency.<sup>899</sup> As with humility, decency was not an easy path to virtue, as one will “often fall into extravagances and follies, thinking to avoid what is reckoned indecent, and the contempt that follows upon it.”<sup>900</sup> Decency was essential to a tranquil society: it “keeps our pride itself in some order; and if it does not restrain our inclinations..., it often hinders them from breaking out.”<sup>901</sup>

---

<sup>897</sup> Hume, 597–98.

<sup>898</sup> Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments* [1759], 172–73.

<sup>899</sup> Forbes, *Moral and Philosophical Essays on Several Subjects*, 225–26.

<sup>900</sup> Forbes, 228.

<sup>901</sup> Forbes, 229.

For James Fordyce in the 1770s, humility was an aspect of decency.<sup>902</sup> He defines humility as “sobriety of mind, and modesty of deportment, proceeding from a lively sense of his frailty and mortality, of his trials and temptations, of his promptness to err and go astray, of his many actual mistakes and deviations.”<sup>903</sup> To be humble is to approach others with respect and understanding. Catherine Macaulay, in the 1790s, sees modesty (or at least its appearance) as essential to ensure polite conversation and social harmony.<sup>904</sup>

As can be seen from the above examples, much of the social utility of shame lay in curbing excess pride. More than any other emotion surveyed here, pride underwent a dramatic reinvention over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Much of the theoretical discussion of pride in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century is of a deadly sin. Associated with vanity, luxury and society, it was decried as the ‘bane of the British nation’.<sup>905</sup> As a result, the increase of pride (and the corresponding decrease of shame) were seen as the underlying ills thought to destroy the very fabric of English society – concerned with houses, and clothes, and pleasures, spending time at the opera and masquerades, rather than on business, seeking pleasure rather than profit.<sup>906</sup>

Moral philosophers in both the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries focussed mainly on three aspects of pride: emulation, ambition, and the love of glory (or fame). These were considered key elements in understanding human behaviour. As Samuel Johnson observed: “Distinction is so pleasing to the

---

<sup>902</sup> James Fordyce, *Addresses to Young Men*, vol. 1 (Dublin: John Exshaw, 1777), 18.

<sup>903</sup> James Fordyce, *Addresses to Young Men*, vol. 2 (Dublin: John Exshaw, 1777), 219.

<sup>904</sup> Catherine Macauley Graham, *Letters on Education* (London: Printed for C. Dilly, 1790), 185.

<sup>905</sup> Erasmus Jones, *Luxury, Pride and Vanity, the Bane of the British Nation.*, The fourth edition, with additions (London: Printed for J. Roberts, 1736).

<sup>906</sup> Jones, 4.

pride of man that a great part of the pain and pleasure of life arise from the gratification or disappointment of an incessant wish for superiority ... Every man, has ... some art by which he imagines that the attention of the world will be attracted.”<sup>907</sup>

The writings of Bernard Mandeville were key to the reinterpretation of pride. For him, pride was a socially useful vice. The work that would make him infamous, *The Grumbling Hive* (1705, republished in 1714 as *The Fable of the Bees*), points out the inherent hypocrisy in urban life – a modest lifestyle may be virtuous, but it is human ambition and desire for distinction which drive the economy and spur political and creative ambition. As Jennifer Herdt observes, the public outcry over the publication of the *Fable* suggests “his readers feared he might be right.”<sup>908</sup> This social utility of pride goes beyond economics; it is through pride (the desire of the approval and admiration of other people) that humans are made moral,<sup>909</sup> or as Mandeville himself phrased it, “the moral Virtues are the Political Offspring Flattery begot upon Pride.”<sup>910</sup>

David Hume clearly was greatly inspired by Mandeville but goes beyond him in his endorsement of pride. Whereas for Mandeville pride was still a vice (albeit a socially useful one), Hume conceives of pride as a virtue, and humility a vice.<sup>911</sup> While Annette Baier has argued that this

---

<sup>907</sup> Samuel Johnson, *The Rambler*, vol. 4 (London: Printed for A. Law, W. Millar, J. Buckland and T. Davis, 1798), 21.

<sup>908</sup> Herdt, *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*, 269.

<sup>909</sup> Dickey, “Pride, Hypocrisy & Civility,” 405.

<sup>910</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: Or Private Vices, Public Benefits.*, 37.

<sup>911</sup> Hume soundly condemns humility – but he does have good words to say about modesty. James Fordyce, in his *Addresses to Young Men*, responds to Hume, and argues that his characterization of humility is based on a flawed reading of Christian theology, and that modesty is part of humility, not a separate value. This is discussed in Stafford, “Concepts of Modesty and Humility in Eighteenth-Century British Discourses.” Herdt also points out that his criticisms of humility are not without precedent in Christian ethics, but echo Thomas Aquinas. Herdt, *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*, 319.

provocative stance is, at least in part, ‘Christian-baiting’,<sup>912</sup> it nevertheless reflects a shift in understandings of pride. Hume’s argument for pride as a virtue does have its qualifications. Only well-regulated pride is virtuous, and its excess or deficiency are still vices. Pride as an emotion produces pleasure (a key aspect in Hume’s definition of virtue) and creates self-esteem and confidence in oneself.<sup>913</sup> Contrary to traditional Christian ethics, Hume sees pride and modesty as complementary virtues; the modesty he recommends involves manners, politeness, and respect for others.<sup>914</sup> A deficiency of pride causes servility, and self-debasement (which is why Hume regards humility as vicious); excessive pride, however, results in many of those qualities listed in contemporary dictionaries: arrogance, haughtiness, insolence; bragging, boastfulness and conceit.<sup>915</sup> Jennifer Herdt has seen Hume as a pivotal part of the ‘bourgeois rehabilitation of pride.’<sup>916</sup>

Central to Hume’s argument that pride is a virtue is its comparison with sympathy. In order for sympathy to function as the “chief source of moral distinctions”, it must first be extended beyond those with whom one has a prior connection.<sup>917</sup> Pride plays a key role here – desire for the admiration of others extends one’s viewpoint beyond that immediate circle, and causes us to value the opinions and sentiments of others.<sup>918</sup> Adam Smith likewise considered the love of glory

---

<sup>912</sup> Annette Baier, *A Progress of Sentiments: Reflections on Hume’s Treatise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 207.

<sup>913</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 596–97.

<sup>914</sup> Taylor, “Hume on the Dignity of Pride,” 43.

<sup>915</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 600.

<sup>916</sup> Herdt, *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*, 306.

<sup>917</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 580–81.

<sup>918</sup> Hume, 316.

to be one of the best passions of human nature.<sup>919</sup> As in Hume, the desire to please others, and the aversion to offending others, is one of the crucial elements bestowed by nature upon society.<sup>920</sup>

## Pride, Shame and Sodomy

The modern post-Freudian, psycho-analytic West views shame as a negative emotion but finds some personal and social value to its companion emotion, guilt. Psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists agree that they are two different emotions but have difficulty in firmly separating them.<sup>921</sup> Following Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1905), many psychoanalysts viewed shame as a regressive emotion, "seen only in children, women, and savage."<sup>922</sup> Cultural anthropologists, following Ruth Benedict's observations on post-war Japan (1946) distinguished between shame cultures, where shame was externally imposed and guilt cultures, which are driven by internalized individual standards. This has since come under fire as an unfair representation of cultural differences.<sup>923</sup> As Miceli and Castelfranchi argue, shame and guilt are both "unpleasant emotions implying a negative self-evaluation against one's own standards; both of them can be experienced either publicly or privately; both can be elicited by the same kind of fault; both can trigger either self-defensive or reparative action tendencies; both can have either adaptive or maladaptive implications; and both can involve the self. What are, then the

---

<sup>919</sup> Cited in Lovejoy, *Reflections on Human Nature*, 191.

<sup>920</sup> Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments* [1759], 170.

<sup>921</sup> Maria Miceli and Cristiano Castelfranchi, "Reconsidering the Differences Between Shame and Guilt," *Europe's Journal of Psychology* 14, no. 3 (2018): 710.

<sup>922</sup> Thomas J. Scheff, "Shame and the Social Bond: A Sociological Theory," *Sociological Theory* 18, no. 1 (2000): 86.

<sup>923</sup> Roger Giner-Sorolla, *Judging Passions: Moral Emotions in Persons and Groups* (London: Psychology Press, 2012), 104.

differences between these emotions?”<sup>924</sup> In their opinion, the difference lies in the degree to which the person experiencing the emotion feels responsible for the action. Shame involves “a self-evaluation of inadequacy to meet the standards of one’s ideal self” while guilt implies a negative self-evaluation against one’s moral standards.<sup>925</sup> Conversely, pride is no longer one of the seven deadly sins, but is conceived as being central to proper emotional and psychological development; one of the key aspects in developing a healthy self-esteem.<sup>926</sup> The fact that most Western cities have a pride parade, where gay, lesbian, bisexual, trans\*, and asexual people can publicly repudiate shame, and express their pride in their sexuality and gender identity, is symptomatic of this dynamic. The shame that is being banished through pride, draws from connections between shame and sexuality which were expanded during the long 18<sup>th</sup> century from Christian theology into the very fabric of civil society.

For 18<sup>th</sup>-century moralists and legislators, the main quality of the unchaste was shamelessness: adulterers, fornicators, sodomites, and masturbators were all shameless. This caused great concern. According to *Onania*, public opinion held that “the Shameless are the worst of People.”<sup>927</sup> Discussions of sodomites during this period were frequently centered on the commission of sodomy as both the cause of shame, and proof of the shamelessness of those who committed it. In 1816, midshipman William Cruchley of the HMS *Africaine*, attempted to cast

---

<sup>924</sup> Miceli and Castelfranchi, “Reconsidering the Differences Between Shame and Guilt,” 724.

<sup>925</sup> Miceli and Castelfranchi, 724–25.

<sup>926</sup> Alessandro Salice and Alba Montes Sánchez, “Pride, Shame, and Group Identification,” *Frontiers in Psychology* 7, no. 557 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00557>.

<sup>927</sup> *Onania: or, the Heinous Sin of Self-Pollution, and all its frightful consequences*, 18<sup>th</sup> Edition, (London: H. Cooke, 1756): 10.

doubt on the testimony of Emmanuel Cruz, by citing his evidence that he had asked Parsons (Crutchley's co-defendant) whether he was ashamed. Against this, he observed to the Court Martial Board, that it was "improbably nay impossible that such a Sodomite such as this Cross, can have any Sense of Shame!"<sup>928</sup> The shaming element of punishments for sodomy and sodomitical assault was used to supplement the sodomites' inborn capability to feel shame, which was seen as deficient.

### Shame, Pride and Sodomy in Elite Circles

As was seen in Chapter 1, Capt. Edward Rigby met servant William Minton for a sexual encounter which turned out to be a trap, at St. George's Tavern in Pall Mall in November 1698. According to Minton's subsequent testimony, Captain Rigby appealed to the authority of Kings to persuade him, telling Minton "...that the French King did it, and the Czar of Muscovy made Alexander, a Carpenter, a Prince for that purpose, and affirmed, He had seen the Czar of Muscovy through a hole at Sea, lye with Prince Alexander."<sup>929</sup> Minton's statement to the magistrate also claimed that Rigby referenced Christ's love for his 'beloved disciple'.<sup>930</sup> While it is possible that Rigby could have seen Peter the Great having sex with Prince Alexander during his visits to the Naval dockyards at Deptford in the winter and spring of 1698,<sup>931</sup> the importance

---

<sup>928</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Court Martial of William Crutchley and George Parsons, January 16-19<sup>th</sup> 1816), TNA

<sup>929</sup> Anon., *An Account of the Proceedings against Capt. Edward Rigby, at the Sessions of Goal Delivery, Held at Justice-Hall in the Old-Bailey, on Wednesday the Seventh Day of December, 1698, for Intending to Commit the Abominable Sin of Sodomy, on the Body of One William Minton*, 2. These words are also in Minton's written information found at MJ/SP/1698/12/024, LMA.

<sup>930</sup> MJ/SP/1698/12/024, LMA. In the printed account, this is summarized as his having said 'several blasphemous things.'

<sup>931</sup> Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House*, 45. Norton names periods of time where the Tsar and Prince Alexander were aboard Royal Navy vessels in 1698; however, there is no conclusive evidence that this incident occurred.

of this statement lies in the fact that Rigby is trying to establish a honorable history of sodomitical desire. When Rigby first stood in the pillory, in late December 1698, he did not exhibit proper shame. The *Flying Post* reported that he “appeared very gay”, and John Ellis later observed to Lord Williamson, he stood “on the Pillory, not with his head in it, dressed like a *beau*.”<sup>932</sup> Over the next 120 years, elite men would feel the shame of being connected with sodomitical behaviours, but also find ways to express a pride in those same feelings.

### “Ruin on your head, and infamy on your name”: Shame and Sodomy among the Elite

In the winter of 1826, a young man named James Rosenberg Tucker, recently dismissed from service in Laytonstone, Essex, sent his former employer (and cousin) James Strangford Tucker a letter threatening to accuse him of committing sodomy with him. He was convicted at the Essex Lent Assizes, and sentenced to be transported for life, arriving in New South Wales on board the *Midas* in March 1827.<sup>933</sup> In his letter, demanding that his cousin take him back in his service, and loan him £5, he emphasized the risks (to Strangford), of remaining obstinate – “ruin on your head, and infamy on your name.” As has been seen in previous chapters, Tucker was not wrong; in addition to the legal problems that could result, even a rumour could destroy a man’s reputation and life. After the punishment of Capt. Rigby, elite men were no longer submitted to

---

<sup>932</sup> *Flying Post*, 20-22 Dec. 1690; J. Ellis to Lord Ambrose Williamson, 20 Dec. 1698, in Great Britain, Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic) of the Reign of William III*. Volume 4. (London: H.M. Stationary Office, 1903), 430.

<sup>933</sup> *Morning Advertiser*, 13 Feb. 1826; *Morning Post*, 13 Feb. 1826; *Evening Mail*, 10 Mar. 1826; *Globe*, 11 Mar. 1826; *Morning Advertiser*, 11 Mar. 1826; *Morning Chronicle*, 11 Mar. 1826; *Public Ledger*, 13 Mar. 1826; *Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, 13 Mar. 1826; *Saunders's Newsletter*, 15 Mar. 1826; *Bath Chronicle*, 16 Mar. 1826; *Oxford Journal*, 18 Mar. 1826; *Southampton Herald*, 20 Mar. 1826; *Hull Packet*, 21 Mar. 1826; *Rex v. Tucker* (1826) 1 Mood 134; SRANSW NRS 1155 Reel 2425 - 443; SRANSW NRS 12188 Reel 397-248.



the pillory, though they were still heavily shamed by their society. Elite sodomites, when faced with discovery, expressed shame in many ways; they fled the country, committed suicide, or attempted to restore their reputation through suing their accusers or charging them with theft.

## Shame and Social Ostracism

As has been seen in Chapter 1, elite and middling rank Britons often expressed their disgust with sodomites by complete social ostracism of anyone associated with sodomy. This technique can be seen most clearly in the situation of William Beckford, who, unlike most men of his rank and station, did not flee the country, but chose to remain. In 1784, Beckford unwisely earned the enmity of Lord Loughborough, then the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, who had recently married William Courtenay's aunt Charlotte. Loughborough, a taciturn, middle-aged Scottish lawyer, was the sort of person Beckford was infamous for mocking, but Beckford did not need to do so for Loughborough to hate him: Charlotte was intimate (and may even have been in love) with Beckford prior to her marriage, but most of all, Beckford was the protégé of Lord Thurlow, Lord Loughborough's most hated political and professional rival. After the relationship between Beckford and Courtenay was discovered, Loughborough applied extreme pressure on his wife's young nephew, but could not get enough evidence for a court of law. Regardless, the power of gossip served nearly as well to destroy Beckford. Loughborough first spread the rumours throughout the family circle. Beckford's brother-in-law, Viscount Strathavon, came to Fonthill to drag his sister away, and slapped Beckford, trying to provoke him into a duel. Margaret Beckford, then pregnant with their first child, refused to abandon her husband.<sup>934</sup> A family

---

<sup>934</sup> Alexander, *England's Wealthiest Son*, 108.

council was then held, and it was decided to send Beckford abroad (without his wife, who could not travel due to her pregnancy); he got as far as Dover on 29 October 1784, before returning to Fonthill.<sup>935</sup> Loughborough then unleashed an anonymous press campaign towards the end of November. An agent in London, writing to his master, Lord Hardwicke, in Bath: “The tea-tables are full of the detection of B—kf—d in a scandalous affair with a boy at Mary[le]bone School. It is remarkable how many detections of this sort have happened of late.”<sup>936</sup> Mrs. Elizabeth Carter and Mrs. Montagu shared details of Beckford’s “horrid behaviour” and expressed their surprise at ‘Poor Lady B.’ failing “to quit her wretched husband”.<sup>937</sup>

While Beckford did not flee the country, he spent as much time as he could abroad: in Switzerland, in France, and in Portugal. In Europe, his wealth and his taste for opera, fine art, and literature endeared him to aristocrats and wealthy members of society; at home, he was placed under a complete social embargo. He was forced to communicate entirely through intermediaries, particularly his friend and secretary Gregorio Franchi. No person of society visited him at his estate while he was resident (other than family and the Earl of Roden), and he was forbidden from visiting his daughters, even after their marriages. As has been seen in Chapter 3, he grew angry at any reference to the cause of his disgrace and could be ruthless in his vengeance.

---

<sup>935</sup> Alexander, 109.

<sup>936</sup> W. Beldam to Lord Hardwicke, 24 November 1784 (Hardwicke Papers, B.M. Add MSS 35, 623), cited in Alexander, 110. Courtenay (then 17 years old), was still a student at Westminster School.

<sup>937</sup> Elizabeth Carter to Elizabeth Montagu, 19 December 1784, printed in *Letters from Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, to Mrs. Montagu, Between the Years 1755 and 1800: Chiefly Upon Literary and Moral Subjects; Published from the Originals in the Possession of the Rev. Montagu Pennington*, ed. Montagu Pennington, vol. 3 (F.C. and J. Rivington, 1817), 233–34.

## “Unhappy NYKY, Whither Dost Thou Stray?": Self-Banishment as a Response to Shame.

In choosing to stay in England, Beckford was choosing an uncommon and difficult path. As has been seen in previous chapters, the most common elite response to the disgrace of a sodomitical charge was to flee the country. Ideally, an elite sodomite would manage to flee prior to being indicted; this allowed them to retain their property and income and avoid the legal penalties of being an outlaw. Newspapers reported that several persons of fortune fled to the continent on being charged with sodomitical practices in 1745.<sup>938</sup> Dr. Walton, the partner of Timothy Raven, hanged at Lincoln in 1754, was supposed to have fled to Italy with Lord D----.<sup>939</sup> A ‘person of fortune’, and holder of a public office, fled in January of 1763.<sup>940</sup>

John Child (1712-1784), 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl Tylney of Castlemaine, fled to Italy in 1768 after being caught with a servant<sup>941</sup>, and never permanently returned, though he did visit his lavish home at Wanstead, Essex, several times. Initial newspaper reports of the Powderham scandal had Beckford fleeing to Naples, to ‘replace’ Tylney, who had just recently died. William Courtenay, as has been seen in previous chapters, fled in 1811 to avoid prosecution, and died in obscurity in France. Finally, in a case which would dominate discourses of sodomy for much of the 1820s, the Right Reverend Percy Jocelyn (1764-1843), Bishop of Clogher, and uncle of the Earl of Roden, was found in the back room of a Haymarket public house, with a Grenadier guardsman

---

<sup>938</sup> *General Evening Post*, 23-25 April 1745; *Westminster Journal*, 27 April 1745.

<sup>939</sup> *Harrop's Manchester Mercury*, 10 Sept. 1754. I have been unable to determine the identity of this man.

<sup>940</sup> *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 12-14 Jan. 1763; *London Chronicle*, 13-15 Jan. 1763.

<sup>941</sup> Geraldine Roberts, *The Angel and the Cad: Love, Loss and Scandal in Regency England* (London: Macmillan, 2015), 22–23.

named John Moverley. Jocelyn absconded from the country upon being bailed by his nephew, first to France, and then to Scotland, where he lived out the rest of his days under an assumed name.<sup>942</sup> In October, 1822 he was tried *in absentia* by the Metropolitan Court of Armagh, for “divers crimes and excesses, and more especially for the crimes of immorality, incontinence, sodomitical practices, habits, and propensities, and neglect of his spiritual, judicial, and ministerial duties.”<sup>943</sup> He was found guilty and deprived of his living in the Church of Ireland.

## Suicide and Shame among the Elite

While, as will be seen below, suicide was often a more common reaction among members of the middling sorts, some elites nevertheless turned to it rather than deal with the shame of being exposed as sodomites. In March of 1751 a young gentleman, genteelly dressed, approached a Soldier in St. James’ Park, and asked if the Soldier would escort him back to Chelsea. When the Soldier agreed, the gentleman “made use of some sodomitical practices.”<sup>944</sup> The Soldier seized him, and the two were apprehended by some people passing by. They spent the night in the St. James’ Roundhouse – by 9 AM the next morning, the gentleman was dead, having hanged himself with his handkerchief.<sup>945</sup> Only a few months later, a gentleman caught in the act in a

---

<sup>942</sup> F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, “The Bishop of Clogher’s Case,” *Notes and Queries* 16, no. 11 (1969): 421–30; F. H. Amphlett Micklewright, “Replies - The Bishop of Clogher’s Case,” *Notes and Queries* 17, no. 5 (1970): 184–86. While there is a gravestone for ‘Thomas Wilson’ (Jocelyn’s assumed name) in Edinburgh, a few years ago an unmarked coffin was found in the Jocelyn family vault at Kilcoo Parish Church in Bryansford, County Down, Northern Ireland. It is assumed that this is the disgraced Bishop of Clogher, returned after death to his family. Cf. Matthew Parris, *The Great Unfrosted: Two Thousand Years of Church Scandal*, ed. Nick Angel (London: Robson Books, 1998); Brian Lacey, *Terrible Queer Creatures: Homosexuality in Irish History* (Dublin: Wordwell Books, 2008).

<sup>943</sup> *Dublin Weekly Register*, 16 Nov. 1822.

<sup>944</sup> *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 16 Mar. 1751.

<sup>945</sup> *General Advertiser [1744]*, 12 Mar. 1750 [1751]; *London Evening Post*, 9–12 Mar. 1751; *Penny London Post (Morning Advertiser)*, 11–13 Mar. 1751; *London Advertiser (Literary Gazette)*, 12 Mar. 1751; *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 16 Mar. 1751.

tavern in the Strand hanged himself with a rope while being confined in the Roundhouse.<sup>946</sup>

Captain Churchill of the HMS *Canterbury* Buss, shot himself in his cabin after being informed that a complaint had been made accusing him of sodomy.<sup>947</sup> In 1776, a young gentleman charged with Sodomy was so distraught that he jumped off Blackfriar's Bridge. He fell on a Coal-Lighter, rather than into the water – he broke all his limbs and had blood streaming from his face. While he was taken to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, he was not expected to survive.<sup>948</sup> If John Richardson's anonymous source is to be believed, Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh and Marquis of Londonderry (who was then Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons), committed suicide because he was being blackmailed for accidentally 'picking up' a transvestite prostitute.<sup>949</sup> According to Rictor Norton, Stewart had an audience with King George IV three days before his suicide, had revealed that he was being blackmailed, and told the King that he was "accused of the same crime as the Bishop of Clogher." Supposedly the King told him to see a physician; Castlereagh instead cut his throat with a penknife.<sup>950</sup>

---

<sup>946</sup> *General Evening Post*, 13-16 July 1751.

<sup>947</sup> T. Smith, HMS Union, the Downs, to Sir John Cleveland, Admiralty, London, 8 June 1757. ADM 1/653, TNA. In Dec. 1758, Captain Churchill's widow wrote to Cleveland, asking for her husband's books and papers to be discharged. He responded that she was not to receive his wages unless she was in severe financial straits. ADM/B/161/37, NMM.

<sup>948</sup> *St. James' Chronicle (British Evening Post)*, 30 Mar.- 2 Apr. 1776; *Public Advertiser*, 1 Apr. 1776.

<sup>949</sup> John Richardson, *Recollections, Political, Literary, Dramatic, and Miscellaneous, of the Last Half-Century: Containing Anecdotes and Notes of Persons of Various Ranks Prominent in Their Vocations, with Whom the Writer Was Personally Acquainted* (London: Printed for the author by Savill & Edwards, 1855), 286, <http://archive.org/details/recollectionspol01rich>.

<sup>950</sup> Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House*, 218. Norton's source (while not clearly identified), is likely Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name*, 91. Hyde does not provide a source for this story. For more on the Castlereagh case, and on the situation for sodomites during the 1820s and 1830s, see Charles Upchurch, *Before Wilde: Sex Between Men in Britain's Age of Reform* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

### “Since He Was Fond of the Law”: Shame, Sodomy, and Libel

Like William Beckford, some elite men facing sodomy and sodomy related charges chose not to flee, but to face their accusers in court. As has been seen in previous chapters, elite men had an advantage in court, when accused by men of a lower rank and station, particularly when the accusers were youths or boys. Some avoided prosecution for years by taking any accusers, even anyone who spread rumours of their tastes, to court. When a gentleman from Banbury, Oxfordshire, identified in the newspapers as ‘J.D.’, was finally arrested and charged, reports alleged that he had been known to be a sodomite for the previous 20 years, but had never before been charged, as he was “fond of the law.”<sup>951</sup>

As was noted in Chapter 3, any rumour or allegation of sodomitical behaviour was immediately dealt with in court; either through charges of conspiracy, or of slander, libel or defamation of character. John Howe, Baron Chedworth, took Lewis Dive, Esq. to court for defamation after the defendant called him a bugger after the plaintiff accidentally trod on his foot.<sup>952</sup> Chedworth told Lord Mansfield after the jury returned its verdict, that he hoped the verdict of £500 damages would “convince even the malevolent of my innocence”, and donated the damages to charity.<sup>953</sup> The Justices of the King’s Bench upheld £500 damages for slander when Joseph Godwin accused Robert Colman, a former Sheriff of Bristol, of having slept with Hooper, a

---

<sup>951</sup> *Oxford Journal*, 19 Apr. 1755.

<sup>952</sup> John Howe Chedworth, *Two Actions, between John Howe, Esq. and George Lewis Dive, Esq: Tried by a Special Jury, ...at the Assizes Holden at Croydon, on Wednesday the 15th of August, 1781*, The second edition (London: Printed for G. Kearsley, and all the booksellers at Guildford, Norwich, Ipswich, and Chelmsford, 1781).

<sup>953</sup> Oldham, *Mansfield Manuscripts*, 2:851–53, n2.

convicted sodomite.<sup>954</sup> In 1809, George Ferrars, Earl of Leicester, brought an action for libel against the *Morning Herald*, for suggesting that he was on the verge of absconding to escape a charge exhibited by Lady Leicester, and that his “infamies have long rendered him a disgrace to human nature.”<sup>955</sup> Leicester asked for £20,000 damages; after evidence proving that “his Lordship’s character was previously as bad in this respect as any man’s could be, who was not actually convicted of the crime,”<sup>956</sup> he was granted only £1000, and 40s. costs. Lord Mansfield was forced to decide in favor of the plaintiff, since he had not in fact been charged with sodomy. Leicester did not attend the hearings himself, as he had fled abroad, his reputation in tatters.<sup>957</sup>

### “Blooming Hebe Resigns to Dazzling Ganymede”: Pride and Sodomy among the Elite.

Chapter 1 considered how moral disgust at sodomy was frequently expressed by removing or mistranslating references to historical and literary examples, particularly Greek and Roman history and literature. Similarly, Chapter 2 examined how elite sodomites turned to many of these to express their feelings in frameworks other than that provided by the dominant culture. This subsection argues that elite sodomites used historical, literary, and geographical examples to give sodomy a proud, even virtuous history, and a noble present. In this, they were inadvertently assisted by satirical writers seeking to shame them.

---

<sup>954</sup> *Colman v. Godwin* (1782) 3 Dougl. 90; *Blizard v. Kelly* (1823) 2 B & C 283; Oldham, 2:857–58. Colman is listed as having been Sherriff of Bristol in 1781. John Latimer, *Annals of Bristol [17th to 19th Century]* (s.l.: W. George’s sons, W. & F. Morgan, 1893), 536.

<sup>955</sup> *Annual Register* (1809): 347.

<sup>956</sup> *Annual Register* (1809): 349.

<sup>957</sup> Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name*, 76.

### “... the French King did it”: Noble Examples as a Source of Pride

As we have seen with Captain Rigby, elite sodomites drew on examples of foreign royalty, like Peter the Great and the King of France.<sup>958</sup> King James I's desire for pretty young men had been explored in pamphlets since at least 1651,<sup>959</sup> and his relationship with the Duke of Buckingham, was used to imply sodomy;<sup>960</sup> in the satirical poem *Mundus Foppiensis*, “the shame of J. the first and Buckingham” refers to sodomy, without needing to mention it. There were also rumours about King William III, and wealthy aristocrats such as the Earl of Sunderland and Lord Hervey.<sup>961</sup> William Beckford took great pride in the fact that his estate, Fonthill, had once belonged to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Castlehaven, executed for sodomy in 1631. Beckford even took on his motto, *De Dieu Tout!*<sup>962</sup> William Beckford, served as both role-model and warning to Lord Byron. According to Henry Lansdown, Byron considered *Vathek* ‘his Gospel’,<sup>963</sup> and was fascinated by his life and fate. In a letter to Francis Hodgson, Byron related a strange coincidence: “On Hartford Bridge we changed horses at an Inn where the great Apostle of Paederasty Beckford ! sojourned for the night. We tried in vain to see the Martyr of prejudice, but could not; what we thought was singular, though perhaps you will not, was that Ld. Courtney

---

<sup>958</sup> As there has yet to be the slightest suspicion regarding the sexual tastes of King Louis XIV (1638-1715), it is likely that the King of France Rigby refers to is Henri III (1574-1589), whose intimate relations with his *mignons* was infamous even in his own day.

<sup>959</sup> Anthony Weldon, *The Court and Character of King James, Written and Taken by Sir A.W.*, Reprint (London: Printed for R. J. and to be sold by J. Wright, 1817).

<sup>960</sup> Ian McCormick, ed., “Mundus Foppensis: Or, The Fop Display'd [1691],” in *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17th and 18th Century Writing* (London: Routledge, 1997), 124.

<sup>961</sup> Goldsmith, *The Worst of Crimes*, 14–15.

<sup>962</sup> Alexander, *England's Wealthiest Son*, 34.

<sup>963</sup> Henry Venn Lansdown, *Recollections of the Late William Beckford of Fonthill, Wilts and Lansdown, Bath [1893]*, ed. Charlotte Lansdown, Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition. (Project Gutenberg, 2006), 32, <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/18809>.



[sic] travelled the same night on the *same road* only one stage coach *behind* him.”<sup>964</sup> In *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Byron refers to Beckford (as Vathek), and describes the (abandoned) mansion which Beckford had rented in the 1790s, as a “thing unblest by Man, / Thy fairy dwelling as lone as thou!”<sup>965</sup> Byron also alludes to Beckford in his Ode *Dives*, which was written in 1811, and likely passed around by word-of-mouth and hand between then and its first publication in 1832.<sup>966</sup> Beckford never forgave him, and refused to meet him or show him the *Episodes of Vathek*, which Byron desperately wished to read.

### “We Shall ... Want Nothing But a Catastrophe Like Nisus and Euryalus”: Greek and Roman Literature as a Source of Pride.

As was seen in Chapter 1, despite bowdlerized translations and omitted speeches, elite and educated men, who were able to read the Greek and Latin originals, knew historical examples of sodomitical love. While in Florence with Stephen Fox in 1728, Lord Hervey wrote (and later published) several poems to his friend. One, the *Ode to Stephen Fox*, is written in the style of Horace, Ode IV, Book 2. In it, he praises Stephen for his love and loyalty in giving up society for a year to accompany his sick friend. Finally, he expresses the desire to live out the rest of his

---

<sup>964</sup> Lord Byron to Francis Hodgson, 25 June 1809. Printed in George Gordon Byron, *Byron's Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of All the Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of All Others*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, vol. 1 (London: J. Murray, 1973), 210. Given that Beckford and Courtenay had been estranged since 1784, Louis Crompton finds it surprising that they would both be visiting the same inn, and observes that Byron's innuendo is clearly wide of the mark. Cf. Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 126.

<sup>965</sup> George Gordon Byron, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, ed. Les Bowler and David Widger, Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition (Project Gutenberg, 2004), Canto 1, stanzas 22-3, <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/5131>. According to Louis Crompton, these lines were suppressed until 9 years after Byron's death, being published in 1833.

<sup>966</sup> Alexander, *England's Wealthiest Son*, 188.

life at Ickworth, Stephen Fox's estate, "with books, with love, with beauty and with thee."<sup>967</sup> In his first volume of poems, written during his relationship with Edlestone, Byron translated several poems which, in their original languages, described loving same-sex relationships. These included a translation of Sappho's Ode and one of Catallus to the youth Juventius.

Writing to his friend Elizabeth Pigot about his beloved John Edlestone in the summer of 1807, Lord Byron gave a list of historical, biblical, and mythological same-sex relationships, all of which he felt his relationship with Edlestone exceeded. "In short," he tells her, "we shall put ... *Pylades & Orestes* out of countenance, & want nothing but a *Catastrophe* like *Nisus & Euryalus*, to give *Jonathan & David* the 'go by.'"<sup>968</sup> He and Matthews frequently used Hyacinth as a short hand for a catamite, referring to the myth of Apollo and Hyacinth.<sup>969</sup> The two also used a phrase in Horace's "Ode to Venus" as a code for sodomitical love (or its lack). This poem contained the line "*Me nec femina nec puer iam nec spes animi credula mutui*", which can be translated as 'Neither maid nor youth delights me now'. A few days before he observed the hyacinths of Falmouth, he asked Hobhouse to tell Matthews: that "I have bade adieu to every species of affection, and may say with Horace '*Me jam nec Faemina*' &c. – he will finish the lines."<sup>970</sup> Later, he wrote to Hobhouse of conjugating the Greek verb "*αυπαζω*" [to embrace, kiss], after

---

<sup>967</sup> John Hervey Hervey, "To Mr. Fox, Written at Florence. In Imitation of Horace, Ode IV. Book 2. By the Late Lord H---y.," in *A Collection of Poems. By Several Hands.*, ed. Robert Dodsley, vol. 3 (London: Printed for R. Dodsley, 1748), 241.

<sup>968</sup> Lord Byron to Elizabeth Pigot, 5 July 1807. Printed in *BLJ*, 1973, 1:124–25.

<sup>969</sup> An example of this can be found in a letter to Matthews, he described the 'botanical' benefits of Falmouth, where he was "surrounded by Hyacinths & other flowers of the most fragrant nature, & I have some intention of culling a handsome Bouquet to compare with the exotics I hope to meet." Lord Byron to Charles Matthews, 22 June 1810. Printed in 1:206–7.

<sup>970</sup> Lord Byron to John Cam Hobhouse, 19 June 1811. Printed in *BLJ*, 1973, 2:49–50; Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 172.

describing the afternoon spent with a Greek youth named Nicolo Giraud. He goes on to quote Horace, *Odes* 1.32, “Et Lycam *nigris* oculis, nigroque *Crine* decorum” [And Lycus beautiful for his black eyes and black hair.”]<sup>971</sup>

## Foreign Examples as a Source of Pride

Foreign climes were also embraced by some elite sodomites as an exotic justification for their desires. Turkey was widely believed to be the ‘sink of lascivious luxury,’<sup>972</sup> and Turks in particular were understood to be particularly addicted to sodomy. In the early 17th century, Scottish traveler William Lithgow commented on Morocco that, “...in the summer time they openly licentiate three thousand common stews of sodomitical boys. Nay, I have seen at midday, in the very market places, the Moors buggering these filthy carrions, and without shame or punishment go freely away.”<sup>973</sup> The Turks, however, “are extremely inclined to all sorts of lascivious luxury; and generally addicted, besides all their sensuall and incestuous lusts, unto Sodomy, which they account as a dainty to digest all their other libidinous pleasures.”<sup>974</sup> While Lithgow visited these countries in the first two decades of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, his work, first published in 1632, was continually re-published throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries.

---

<sup>971</sup> Lord Byron to John Cam Hobhouse, 23 Aug. 1810. Printed in *BLJ*, 1973, 2:14. Shaken by the deaths in 1811 of his mother and Matthews so close together, Byron made a will, in which he left £7000 to Nicolo Giraud of Athens. Cf. Crompton, *Byron and Greek Love*, 173.

<sup>972</sup> Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House*, 252.

<sup>973</sup> William Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse of the Rare Adventures & Painefull Peregrinations of Long Nineteen Yeares Travayles from Scotland to the Most Famous Kingdomes in Europe, Asia and Affrica [1632]* (Glasgow: J. MacLehose, 1906), 323, <http://archive.org/details/totalldiscourse00lithuoft>.

<sup>974</sup> Lithgow, 145–46.

Combining xenophobia, homophobia, and misogyny, popular writers were quick to establish rhetorical links between foreign nations (particularly France, Italy, and the Ottoman states), luxury (particularly opera, art, and fashion), and sodomy. This connection, expressed most often through satire, will be discussed below. Elite sodomites used this connection to more safely express their emotions and desires. As was seen in Chapter 2, Thomas Gray used examples from the Koran, and from Persian literature to express his love for Horace Walpole. Richard Payne Knight's *Discourse on the Worship of Priapus* (1786-7), describing a phallic cult in Etruscan Italy, was too strongly sodomitical, even for the Dilettanti.<sup>975</sup>

William Beckford, on his return from self-imposed exile in Portugal, turned his estate into an Arabian harem, filled with beautiful boys, protected by his own militia.<sup>976</sup> While abroad, Beckford wrote of his experiences in a thinly veiled fantasy-autobiography, *The History of the Caliph Vathek*, first published in 1786. Vathek, the caliph satiated with sensual pleasures, is clearly based on Beckford himself, while his lover, the occasionally cross-dressing Prince Gulcherouz, is modelled on Courtenay. Vathek ultimately kills both Gulcherouz, and 50 lovely lads (who he had watched engaging in public sexual acts) – the boys are immediately taken to heaven and a life of perpetual childhood surrounded by beautiful boys – Vathek himself ends up in Hell. Hester Thrale, upon reading *Vathek*, found Beckford's descriptions of Gulcherouz as

---

<sup>975</sup> The unexpected reactions to this work are described in George Rousseau, "The Sorrows of Priapus: Anticlericalism, Homosocial Desire, and Richard Payne Knight," in *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*, ed. George Rousseau and Roy Porter (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1987), 101–53.

<sup>976</sup> Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House*, 221.

suspiciously “luscious.”<sup>977</sup> The sodomitical elements of *Vathek* are disguised (albeit only thinly); in the *Episodes of Vathek*, which Beckford never published in his lifetime, they are explicit.

By 1807 Beckford was calling himself Barzaba (from bar saba, the Syrian word for ‘voluptuary’, or ‘boy-fancier’) in letters to Gregorio Franchi. Upon his return to England, he built his elaborate house at Fonthill, barricading his estate with an eight-mile-long, twelve-foot-high wall topped by iron spikes; he lived there with a dwarf as his doorkeeper (with whom he shared pornography), a French abbé to confide his boy-troubles, an Italian physician and a harem of boy-servants. In fact, the only female in the place was Caroline, his beloved cocker-spaniel. In his letters, he gives them nicknames, many of them sexual, such as Miss Long, Miss Butterfly,<sup>978</sup> Countess Pox, Mr. Prudent Well-Sealed-up, and the Turk (Ali-dru, an Albanian, with whom Beckford traveled and bathed). In the fall of 1807, Beckford pleaded with Franchi to persuade a young circus performer to come and stay at Fonthill; Saunders, a young man aged about 18, was described as “the certain captivator of every bugger’s soul.” In letters to Franchi, Beckford denies that Paradise is in Syria, Mesopotamia, or Ceylon, but in Bristol; it is wherever Saunders is to be found. He also used terms from the Middle East to describe places associated with the sodomitical subculture in London: the area around the Seven Dials in St. Giles’ he called ‘the Holy Land’ and spoke of his desire to go there and ‘kiss the relics.’<sup>979</sup>

---

<sup>977</sup> Diary entry for November 1796. Piozzi, *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*, 2:969 n2. Her remarks on Beckford are made in comparison to comments on Richard Cumberland’s *Henry* (1795), in which she found he “dwells upon the personal charms of his heroes always with a luscious fondness exceedingly particular, as if he was in Love with them himself.”

<sup>978</sup> ‘Butterfly’ was a slang term for catamite, likely due to the similarity between the Spanish words for butterfly (mariposa) and catamite (maricon).

<sup>979</sup> William Beckford to Gregorio Franchi, 1 July 1812, printed in Beckford, *Life at Fonthill*. Historians have started to identify the relationship between sodomy, effeminacy, and race in the 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Cf. Rudi C.

## Shame and Pride among the Middling Sorts

Shame punishments were key to making convicted (and suspected) sodomites feel the shame for violating the norms of their society. As will be seen below, this was primarily achieved through legal punishments (such as the pillory, or military punishments such as running the gauntlet) and extra-legal ones (such as charivari and other means of humiliation).<sup>980</sup> Where evidence was strong enough to merit execution, accounts of the final confessions of convicted sodomites emphasize the shame and regret of the condemned. Some men, particularly those of the middling ranks, killed themselves rather than face this fate; actions which were attributed to shame and/or guilt. Some sodomites reveal a knowledge of a proud history of same sex love and refused to consider their relationships as inherently shameful. This section will consider how sodomites and homoromantic men of the middling sorts navigated the shame of their nature and tried to find a source of pride.

## Shame and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

English society used shame to enforce moral and behavioural standards: shame punishments, whether imposed by the community or the government, provided an important role enforcing behavioral norms. In the early modern period, and continuing well into the long 18<sup>th</sup> century, this had included community justice, charivari, and running the gauntlet.<sup>981</sup> It was also seen through

---

Bleys, *The Geography of Perversion: Male-To-Male Sexual Behavior Outside the West and the Ethnographic Imagination, 1750-1918* (New York: New York University Press, 1996). Jeng-Guo S. Chen, "Gendering India: Effeminacy and the Scottish Enlightenment's Debates over Virtue and Luxury," *The Eighteenth Century* 51, no. 1/2 (2010): 193–210.

<sup>980</sup> While sodomitical assaults were not treated any more severely by the judiciary than other misdemeanors, the reaction of the crowd could often be vicious.

<sup>981</sup> Running the gauntlet was an informal punishment practiced in the Royal Navy, which occurred when there was insufficient evidence to pursue formal charges, but there was enough evidence (in the Captain's eyes), to require

various forms of public punishments; through the pillory, flogging, and public executions.

Michel Foucault considers discipline a capillary form of power, which operates “within the social body, rather than above it.”<sup>982</sup> Capillary power is “the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes, and their everyday lives.” As Ailsa Kay observes, “Affect is one additional route ‘into’ the body and its actions.”<sup>983</sup>

### “... the Pillory ... more Terrible for the Shame”: Sodomy, the Middling Sorts, and the Shame of Punishment.

As Bernard Mandeville observed in 1724, shame was central to the punishment of a number of crimes; however, it was not the punishment itself which was shameful, but the making public the fact that the person punished had engaged in behavior which was considered shameful and scandalous.<sup>984</sup> According to Mandeville, it is neither the law nor the punishment itself, which is the source of shame, but the views of the public. The shame comes from being associated with something that violates the emotional/moral norms of the community – if the offender does not see themselves as part of that community, or sees themselves as part of a different community, with divergent emotional/moral norms, this prevents the offender from feeling shame, or can

---

some sort of punishment. While this was most commonly performed in cases of petty theft, it was performed on at least a few occasions for suspected sodomitical activity.

<sup>982</sup> Michel Foucault, *Power-Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, trans. Colin Gordon (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1980), 39.

<sup>983</sup> Ailsa Kay, “Trade in Feelings: Shame in Eighteenth-Century Britain” (Ph.D. Thesis, McMaster University, 2012), 6, <https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/bitstream/11375/12761/1/fulltext.pdf>.

<sup>984</sup> Bernard Mandeville, *A Modest Defence of Publick Stews: Or, an Essay Upon Whoring. As It Is Now Practis'd in These Kingdoms*. (London: T. Read, 1740), 37.

manifest itself as pride.<sup>985</sup> For the middling ranks, who felt keenly their place in civic and social life, the punishment of the pillory was perhaps most successful in transmitting shame.

The pillory was the primary way that those convicted of sodomitical offences were made to feel the shame of violating the norms of their society.<sup>986</sup> Nearly all men convicted of sodomitical assault during this period were subjected to the pillory (often multiple times for a single offence) - of the 20 men convicted of sodomitical offences at the Old Bailey between 1720 and 1750, 14 of them served at least one stand in the pillory;<sup>987</sup> over the course of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century, over a hundred men were convicted to stand in the pillory for sodomitical offenses.<sup>988</sup> For those in the Army and Navy, other forms of punishment served much the same purpose as the pillory. In the Army, those convicted of sodomitical behavior were usually drummed out of the service, with a sign around their neck declaring the offence for which they were punished. A Centinel of Col. Fitzroy's Company, 1<sup>st</sup> Regiment of Footguards faced such a fate, after receiving his 600 lashes for sodomitical practices,<sup>989</sup> as did another soldier in St. James' Park only a week later.<sup>990</sup> In some cases, the men were not tried by court martial first, but simply drummed out of the regiment and remanded to civilian courts. Two young Londoners, Francis Russel and Turner

---

<sup>985</sup> Stephen P. Garvey, "Can Shaming Punishments Educate?," *University of Chicago Law Review* 65, no. 3 (1998): 748.

<sup>986</sup> While sodomitical assaults were not treated any more severely by the judiciary than other misdemeanors, the reaction of the crowd could often be vicious.

<sup>987</sup> Bartlett, "Sodomites in the Pillory in Eighteenth-Century London," 557.

<sup>988</sup> I have found 107 men convicted of sodomitical assault between 1691 and 1828 across England who served time in the pillory. This is largely drawn from newspaper accounts, and likely underestimates the occurrence. This also does not include the many men in the Navy, who experienced different shaming punishments, such as running the gauntlet, and corporal punishment such as whipping.

<sup>989</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post*, 13-15 Aug. 1747; *Penny London Post*, 14-17 Aug. 1747.

<sup>990</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post*, 22-25 Aug. 1747; *Penny London Post*, 24-26 Aug. 1747; *Westminster Journal*, 29 Aug. 1747. The proximity of the incident suggests the two men may have been together, but this is supposition.



Bookin, members of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, were promptly discharged on being discovered: they were committed to prison in Shrewsbury, and sentenced to death in the summer of 1760.<sup>991</sup>

In a bit of classic military humour, the commander of their Company joked that “none were fit to serve his Majesty but such as dared on all Occasions to face a man,” something the *London Evening Post* found greatly to his honour.<sup>992</sup> William Green and James Harrison, two soldiers of the Light Dragoons, were sent to prison by Richard Ford at Bow-Street.<sup>993</sup>

This does not seem to have been the practice for members of the Navy, except when the encounter occurred on shore, with a civilian.<sup>994</sup> Instead, seamen found engaged in sodomitical behavior were subject to two different shame punishments – if there was enough evidence (and the ship was close enough to a harbor for ease of assembly), then there was a court martial. If there was insufficient evidence (or a court martial was difficult to arrange), several summary punishments were available.<sup>995</sup> Captains were allowed to order up to a dozen lashes (this number was increased over the course of the century), and there was also the punishment of ‘running the gauntlet’. This punishment, first adopted in 1661 as a punishment for petty theft, required the

---

<sup>991</sup> This was later commuted to standing in the pillory and finding sureties for their good behaviour for two years. *Public Advertiser*, 29 May 1760; *London Evening Post*, 29-31 May 1760; *Public Ledger*, 6 Aug. 1761.

<sup>992</sup> *London Evening Post*, 29-31 May 1760.

<sup>993</sup> *World*, 4 Nov 1793; *Public Advertiser*, 9 Dec 1793. They were acquitted of sodomy at the Old Bailey, *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, December 1793, trial of WILLIAM GREEN JAMES HARRISON (t17931204-52), but convicted of the misdemeanor in January of 1794, and served 12 months in Newgate Prison.

<sup>994</sup> In the case of Captain Rigby, he was sent to Newgate prison and tried by the Admiralty Court at the Old Bailey. There is a great deal of correspondence as to whether he was to be paid for his service, following his being convicted of sodomitical practices at the Old Bailey. Cf. ADM/A/1860/15, 17 and ADM/A/1860/97, NMM. He was paid, which helped defray his £1000 fine.

<sup>995</sup> Court Martials at sea could be very difficult to arrange. For a good discussion of the reach and limitations of naval judgement, cf. John D Byrn, *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy: Discipline on the Leeward Islands Station, 1784-1812* (Aldershot, UK: Scolar Press, 1989); Markus Eder, *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy of the Seven Years' War, 1755-1763* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004).

offender to run between facing ranks of sailors who beat him with their belts and rope ends.<sup>996</sup>

When found guilty of uncleanness (the naval equivalent of sodomitical assault), they were dismissed from the Navy, and rowed ashore with a sign around their necks stating the nature of their offense. This was usually preceded by being whipped ‘round the fleet’ – lashes were distributed equally alongside all the ships then present. Officers such as Christopher Beauchamp and James Bruce (both midshipmen), were cashiered from service, and sentenced to two years’ solitary confinement in Marshalsea Prison.<sup>997</sup> Elements that could add humiliation were frequently sought out, particularly for summary punishments. When two sailors aboard the HMS *Princess Amelia* were discovered engaging in unspecified sodomitical practices, the Captain summoned the 20 women on board and had them whip the offenders.<sup>998</sup> In addition to the shame of having their punishment at the hands of women, the Captain of the *Princess Amelia* reinforced the idea discussed in Chapter 2, that the women were the ones most harmed by the existence of sodomy.

### “He Could Bear Poverty, But Not Shame”: Shame, Suicide and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

Sometimes, the sense of shame, or fear of being shamed, was so strong that the accused felt no option but to kill themselves. Favored methods were hanging themselves, or slitting their own throats; others shot themselves, or took poison. A few left suicide notes, but generally the reasons the men took their own life was left to the interpretations of others; and the reason that

---

<sup>996</sup> Byrn, *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy*, 77, 89.

<sup>997</sup> ADM 1/5453 (Court Martial of Christopher Beauchamp and James Bruce, 6-15 Jan. 1816), TNA.

<sup>998</sup> *London Evening Post*, 18-20 Nov. 1742; *Universal Spectator*, 20 Nov. 1742. As with accounts of the pillory, there is a focus here on the women as being the aggrieved parties.

most gave was to avoid the shame. In 1701, Mr. Jermaine, a Parish Clerk at St. Dunstan's, London, cut his throat upon being turned out of his position after being accused of sodomy by two boys.<sup>999</sup> According to the writer of the March issue of the *Post Angel*, Mr. Jermaine was first given the opportunity to flee London, rather than be charged, that "he might be secured from the Scandal and Reproach that such a Brutish and Unnatural Sin as *Sodomy* deserves". At first, he insisted that he would rather be tried than lose his living; however, later that night, in contemplation of the shame, and in fear of the consequences, he slit his own throat with a razor.<sup>1000</sup> The author of the *Post Angel* considers that it was shame which "cast him into Desperation."<sup>1001</sup> London schoolteacher Isaac Broderick cut his throat with a razor the night before he was due to stand in the pillory: he failed to reach his windpipe, and did not die.<sup>1002</sup>

An unusual case occurred at the Gill Alehouse, in Bell Alley, off Coleman Street, London, in September of 1731. Two well-dressed men entered the ale house and asked for a private room. While there, they had a quarrel, and one man tried to flee without his hat. The other man demanded he be brought back and accused him of being a sodomite. Having been charged in front of so many witnesses, the alleged sodomite attempted to cut his own throat. Luckily, a surgeon named Mr. Woodham was in the house, and acted quickly to save the man's life. Where the case becomes unusual is that, after Mr. Woodham patched up the patient, he was permitted to

---

<sup>999</sup> *Post Angel*, March 1701, 149.

<sup>1000</sup> *Ibid.*, 150.

<sup>1001</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>1002</sup> *British Journal*, 30 May 1730; *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 30 May 1730. Broderick later insisted that this account was a lie invented by his prosecutor, to further blacken and destroy his character. Isaac Broderick, *An Appeal to the Public: Or, the Case of Mr. Isaac Broderick, Late of Trinity College Cambridge, Fairly and Impartially Stated*. (London: Printed for the author, 1731), 60. Broderick has been discussed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4: he was convicted of attempting sodomy with two of his students, aged 10 and 11.

simply walk away, while the man who accused him was secured in the Poultry Compter till the next morning, and then released. The editor of the *Grub Street Journal* demanded to know why the sodomite had just been allowed to walk away. In his view, the surgeon should have treated his throat, but “only to prepare it for the noose.”<sup>1003</sup> Whether the charge was serious, or merely an accusation made under the influence of alcohol and anger, the fact that the shame of it caused such an extreme reaction points to the deep cultural opprobrium faced by men accused of this crime.

Suicide could occur at any point in the process: at detection, before trial, before punishment, in prison. Isted, a farmer in the Fleet Prison for smuggling, was convinced, when drunk, to have sex with Lambeth, a fellow prisoner (also for smuggling); the two were caught, and by 3 AM, Isted (now sober), made a full confession and slit his throat out of guilt. He died of his injuries within two hours.<sup>1004</sup> A Mr. Fullwood was found drowned in a river near Coleshill, Warwickshire; having been often accused of sodomitical practices, it was rumoured that his death was a suicide, due to his having been detected in sodomy with a boy the day before.<sup>1005</sup> Mr. Capps, Steward to Henry Bathurst, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl Bathurst, in Cirencester, Gloucestershire, shot himself in the head in his room. Unlike the men mentioned above, he left a suicide note to his Master, explaining his

---

<sup>1003</sup> *Grub Street Journal*, 7 Oct. 1731.

<sup>1004</sup> *London Evening Post*, 18-20 June 1751; *London Morning Penny Post*, 19-21 June 1751; *General Advertiser* (1744), 20 June 1751; *London Daily Advertiser* (*Literary Gazette*), 20 June 1751; *Read's Weekly Journal* (*British Gazetteer*), 22 June 1751.

<sup>1005</sup> *London Evening Post*, 6-9 July 1752; *General Advertiser* (1744), 9 July 1752; *Derby Mercury*, 10 July 1752; *Read's Weekly Journal* (*British Gazetteer*), 11 July 1752.

actions. In his note, he explained that there would be those who would accuse him of sodomy and begged him not to believe them. He explained that he could bear poverty, but not shame.<sup>1006</sup>

John Clarke, already in prison in Berkshire on a charge of attempted sodomy, hanged himself following the interception of a letter to his companions, which made public details of his behavior.<sup>1007</sup> In Elme, Somersetshire, a Miller hanged himself the day after he had been detected in sodomitical practices.<sup>1008</sup> A man caught *in flagrante* by a Centinel in St. James' Park threw himself into Rosamund's Pond, and drowned.<sup>1009</sup> A Southwark tradesman detected in sodomy with his apprentice (13), committed suicide,<sup>1010</sup> as did an unnamed man, who belonged to an unspecified public office after having been detected with a 16-year-old boy.<sup>1011</sup> James Newland hanged himself in the Wood Street Compter in 1773 after having been committed for sodomitical practices.<sup>1012</sup> William Sell committed suicide in Ipswich in 1779, rather than face the shame of the pillory, by taking poison. Unfortunately, the poison was slow-acting, and he wound up being pilloried anyway, dying of poison only afterwards.<sup>1013</sup> Another unusual case was that of a soldier

---

<sup>1006</sup> *British Spy* (New Universal London Weekly Journal), 2 Aug. 1755; *Read's Weekly Journal* (British Gazetteer), 2 Aug. 1755.

<sup>1007</sup> *London Chronicle*, 22-25 Mar. 1760; *London Evening Post*, 22-25 Mar. 1760; *Universal Chronicle* (Westminster Journal), 22-29 Mar. 1760; *Whitehall Evening Post* (London Intelligencer), 22-25 Mar. 1760; *Public Ledger*, 25 Mar. 1760. Clarke's death was ruled a suicide, and he was buried on the Highway, near Reading.

<sup>1008</sup> *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, 29 Dec. 1763; *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 30 Dec. 1763- 2 Jan. 1764; *Public Advertiser*, 3 Jan. 1764; *Oxford Journal*, 4 Jan. 1764. Like Clarke, he was buried at the crossroads.

<sup>1009</sup> *Middlesex Journal* (*Chronicle of Liberty*), 14-16 June 1770. According to H. B. Wheatley, Rosemond's Pond was filled in after June 1770, which would make this man one of the last to have drowned there. It had a reputation as being a site where young women, unlucky in love, would drown themselves. See Henry Benjamin Wheatley and Peter Cunningham, *London Past and Present: Its History, Associations, and Traditions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 168.

<sup>1010</sup> *London Evening Post*, 17-19 Sept. 1772.

<sup>1011</sup> *London Evening Post*, 19-22 Dec. 1772; *Middlesex Journal*, 19-22 Dec. 1772.

<sup>1012</sup> *London Evening Post*, 30 Nov. – 2 Dec. 1773.

<sup>1013</sup> *Ipswich Journal*, 31 July 1779.

named Thomas Allcock. He was due to be tried at the Old Bailey in 1793, for having extorted money from the Prosecutor, a man named Cripps, who was a servant of Lady Camelford, by threatening to accuse him of sodomy. Allcock had alleged in his defence, that Cripps had given him the money for his silence after Allcock had refused his sexual advances in Green Park. Allcock was discharged, after Cripps failed to appear in court – according to the newspapers, Cripps had thrown himself into the Thames near Barnes when he heard that another soldier was going to be testifying on Allcock’s behalf, who might impeach his character.<sup>1014</sup>

What do all these cases tell us about the role of shame in the long 18th century? Suicide was held as a grievous sin, one as serious as sodomy itself; those who succeeded, and whose deaths were judged to be suicides, were buried on the highway, or at the crossroads, and denied a proper Christian burial. That the shame and ignominy of sodomitical behavior being discovered was so feared by these men of a particular social status that suicide seemed preferable, shows how shame becomes internalized, and the gaze of others is not required to be physically present.

## Pride and Sodomy among the Middling Sorts

As the quotation from Mandeville shows, the pillory is only shameful if the person being pilloried feels shame from the exposure. Legal theorists and moralists in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century held doubts about the efficacy of either the pillory or the gallows to truly educate ‘the mob’; all

---

<sup>1014</sup> *World*, 13 Sept. 1793; *London Chronicle*, 19-21 Sept. 1793; *E. Johnson's British Gazette*, 29 Sept. 1793. A transcript of Allcock’s trial can be found here: *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1793, trial of THOMAS ALLCOCK (t17930911-42). In an intriguing coincidence, Cripps’ employer, Lady Camelford, was the recent widow of Thomas Pitt, 1<sup>st</sup> Baron Camelford, who is believed by historian Thomas Mowl to have been ‘outed’ by Hester Thrale. See Mowl, *Horace Walpole*, lxxx. He cites Mrs. Thrale-Piozzi, who called him a “lady-like man”.

too often, it seemed to be a source of pride, rather than shame.<sup>1015</sup> The existence of private clubs, secret signals, and public sex acts all spoke to a rejection of shame, and the embracing of an identity outside society. While these were intended as methods of self-preservation in a hostile society, they were understood as a dangerous rejection of social mores. Much of the outrage stems from the publicity of sodomy; in dark alleys, the backrooms of public houses, in parks. However, attempts at privacy were deemed even more disturbing – part of the horror of the molly clubs was that they were disguised as ‘normal’ homosocial institutions. Clubs such as that at Warrington, Lancashire, took the added precaution of styling themselves Masons, to provide a cover for meeting every week.<sup>1016</sup> This section shall consider how sodomites of the middling sorts expressed pride in themselves by refusing to feel shame, and turn satire into a source of pride.

### “... There is No Crime In Making What Use I Please of My Body”: Sodomy, Liberty and Pride

Pride as a quality was frequently attributed to sodomites who failed to express the shame and penitential behavior expected of someone who violated the moral norms of their emotional community. When William Brown was arrested in Moorfields in 1726 for his involvement with Thomas Newton, he answered the Magistrates’ query as to why he took such liberties, that “I did it because I thought I knew him, and I think there is no Crime in making what use I please of my

---

<sup>1015</sup> Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree*.

<sup>1016</sup> Cocks, “Safeguarding Civility.”

body.”<sup>1017</sup> Accounts of the conviction and hanging of Crutchard and Arnold at Bristol in 1753 make much of the fact that they refused to confess before society.<sup>1018</sup>

As will be seen below, very few defenses of sodomy were offered outside of satire. Jeremy Bentham privately condemned the criminalization of (consensual) sodomy but did not publish his thoughts on the subject.<sup>1019</sup> Those who did attempt to speak in favor often found themselves at odds with their company. The 1772 edition of *The Tricks of the Town laid open*, describes the unfortunate fate of a man for observing that he did not think Captain Jones deserved to be hanged: he was beaten by the company, and had chamber-pots emptied upon his head.<sup>1020</sup> This same story is found in the *General Evening Post*, which identifies the man as noted sodomite Samuel Drybutter.<sup>1021</sup>

Some educated men tried to make available to those who could not read ancient languages, examples of sodomitical love (and sex) in Greek and Roman literature and mythology. One such man was Thomas Cannon, whom John Cleland nicknamed ‘Molly’ Cannon.<sup>1022</sup> In 1749, he wrote

---

<sup>1017</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1726, trial of William Brown (t17260711-77).

<sup>1018</sup> *London Evening Post*, 4-6 Sept. 1753; *Public Advertiser*, 4 Sept. 1753; *Public Advertiser*, 6 Sept. 1753; *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 8 Sept. 1753; *Public Advertiser*, 11 Sept. 1753; *London Evening Post*, 15-18 Sept. 1753; *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 15 Sept. 1753; *Harrop’s Manchester Mercury*, 18 Sept. 1753; *Public Advertiser*, 18 Sept. 1753; *Read’s Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 22 Sept. 1753; *Oxford Journal*, 22 Sept. 1753; *Ipswich Journal*, 22 Sept. 1753; *Harrop’s Manchester Mercury*, 25 Sept. 1753.

<sup>1019</sup> His manuscript was later published: Bentham, “Jeremy Bentham’s Essay on ‘Pederasty’: Part II.”

<sup>1020</sup> *The Tricks of the Town Laid Open; or, A Companion for Country Gentlemen; To Which Is Added, an Appendix: Containing, Three Letters. Giving Some Curious Anecdotes Relating to Captain J---s, B---St-Ff, and D--b--r; with an Entire New Description of a Catamite’s First Salutation to a Stranger.*, The seventh edition. (London: Printed for G. Allen and A. Lindsay, 1772).

<sup>1021</sup> *General Evening Post*, 22-25 Aug. 1772.

<sup>1022</sup> Hal Gladfelder, *Fanny Hill in Bombay: The Making and Unmaking of John Cleland* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2012), 48. Cleland affixed a letter to Cannon’s door, calling him Molly Cannon, and accusing him of being an ‘execrable, white-faced, rotten catamite.’



and published *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplified*. Cannon and Cleland were friends at one time, but in February 1748 Cannon had Cleland arrested for debt. While in Fleet prison, Cleland wrote and published *Fanny Hill*, the first edition of which has one of the only explicit same-sex sex scenes in 18<sup>th</sup>-century British Literature.<sup>1023</sup> This landed Cleland in prison again, this time for obscenity; in turn, he reported Cannon for writing a ‘Defense of Sodomy.’<sup>1024</sup> Cannon fled the country, the publisher was tried for obscenity, and all known copies were destroyed.<sup>1025</sup> However, in 2012, Hal Gladfelder found a copy of the publisher’s indictment, which contained long excerpts of the book, particularly those which contain explicit same-sex sexuality, and those that most passionately praise it.<sup>1026</sup> Cannon’s book contains passages from classical authors, particularly Lucian, Petronius, Aeschylus, Plato, and more modern examples, such as the seventeenth century French historian and pornographer Nicholas Chorier, and a story set in St. James’ Park between a man he names Amorio and a youth he names Hyacinth.

In addition, the frequent reprints of previous court cases, including that of William Brown (mentioned above), and newspapers accounts of middling sodomites who denied there was any shame to be felt in their actions, helped men root their identity in concepts of personal liberty and bodily autonomy. Samuel Drybutter was reported as proudly declaring himself to be a

---

<sup>1023</sup> Perhaps unsurprisingly, Cannon’s work was the other explicit description, and was published only a few weeks after *Fanny Hill*.

<sup>1024</sup> Foxon, *Libertine Literature in England 1660-1745*, 54.

<sup>1025</sup> Goldsmith, *The Worst of Crimes*, 10.

<sup>1026</sup> Hal Gladfelder, “In Search of Lost Texts: Thomas Cannon’s *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplified*,” *Eighteenth-Century Life* 31, no. 1 (December 21, 2007): 22–38, <https://doi.org/10.1215/00982601-2006-006>; Gladfelder, “The Indictment of John Purser, Containing Thomas Cannon’s *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplified*.”

sodomite.<sup>1027</sup> Nehemiah Taylor, the Surgeon of the HMS *Jamaica*, told the Rev. Howell the night before he was hanged that “he had a right to do with himself as he pleased, and was not accountable to God.”<sup>1028</sup> This same article reports that Mr. Taylor based his arguments on readings of Bolingbroke, Rousseau and Voltaire, as well as the evidence of the widespread existence of sodomitical clubs, and the cultural acceptance of sodomy in France and in the Mediterranean. A few years after the execution of Mr. Taylor, another William Brown, a Boatswain’s mate aboard the HMS *Africaine*, was said to have declared that if men desired to have sex with men, it was because God had created in them that desire.<sup>1029</sup>

### “... Great Persons ... Used That Way”: Satire, Sodomy, and Pride Among the Middling Sorts

Satire is intended as a cause of shame – to serve as a mirror to people and behaviors the author (as self-appointed mouthpiece for their society) deems to be morally reprehensible. Its purpose is to cause others to think worse of those being satirized. It is intended to humiliate, by making the person a source of mockery and amusement, piercing their sense of pride and self-esteem. Once the satires are published, however, the author has little control over how people react to their writing. While the authors were intending to shame elite sodomites, they were inadvertently spreading awareness that sodomy had a history, and that it had noble, powerful figures who

---

<sup>1027</sup> This has been discussed in Chapter 2.

<sup>1028</sup> *Northampton Mercury*, 6 Jan. 1810. However, Taylor apparently changed his mind due to Rev. Howell’s conversation, and died acknowledging the grievous nature of his crime.

<sup>1029</sup> ADM 1/2427 (Declarations of Wayman et al., 13 Oct. 1815), TNA. No charges were pursued against William Brown.

engaged in it. Sodomy had both a history, and a noble present; when Williamson Goodman tried to seduce Henry Thompson in 1730, he told him “of great Persons that used that way.”<sup>1030</sup>

Satire, whether politically or culturally motivated, associated sodomy with elite culture, with wealth and luxury. In *Mundus Foppensis: or, The Fop Display'd*, the Fop’s interest in dress and fashion is clearly linked with sodomy and political corruption. “And then they study wanton use/Of Spanish Red, and white Ceruse;/The only Painters to the Life,/That seem with Natures self at strife;/ .../And only what renews the shame/ of J. the first, and *Buckingham*.”<sup>1031</sup> Like Opera, masquerades were another route by which luxury and love of pleasure could become sodomy – Bishop Gibson, who spearheaded many of the raids on molly houses in the 1720s, was particularly opposed to masquerades, with their inversion of gender roles and intermixing of different socio-economic groups.<sup>1032</sup>

The *Love Letters Between a certain late Nobleman and the famous Mr. Wilson*, is an epistolary story, published in 1723, chronicles the evolution of a sodomitical relationship, one driven by passion, intrigue and money. It has the “pseudo-aristocratic, slightly risqué air of the *chronique scandaleuse*,”<sup>1033</sup> Widely recognized as a work of satire,<sup>1034</sup> David Greenberg postulates that it

---

<sup>1030</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, January 1730, trial of Williamson Goodman, alias Goodbarn (t17300116-31).

<sup>1031</sup> McCormick, “Mundus Foppensis: Or, The Fop Display’d [1691],” 124.

<sup>1032</sup> Bishop Gibson’s campaign against both sodomy and masquerades is detailed in Azfar, “Genealogy of an Execution.” A discussion of masquerades in 18<sup>th</sup>-century British Literature can be found in Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1986).

<sup>1033</sup> McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire*, 92.

<sup>1034</sup> Only Rictor Norton considers these to be genuine letters; he spends a whole chapter trying to figure out which nobleman could have been Wilson’s lover. This is a recurrent problem in Norton’s writing, he frequently takes satires as face value. Cf. Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House*, Chap. 2.

may have been written with the same reformist agenda underlying the novels of Samuel Richardson, highlighting the Lord's callous treatment of Cloris, the young woman he seduces, impregnates, abandons, and finally beats to death, all to disguise his interest in men – a warning to young women on the dangers of aristocratic rakes.<sup>1035</sup> Cameron McFarlane argues that it is not really about sodomy or love at all, but an indictment of trade and money not tied to property, in the wake of the collapse of the South Sea Bubble.<sup>1036</sup> In his formulation, Wilson's exchange of sexual favours for wealth and privilege reflects the dangers of newly wealthy men, who have no land to tie them to society. Regardless of the purpose behind the satire, it explicitly frames a sodomitical relationship as romantic, using the phrases and expressions typical to an aristocratic love-story.

In a satire attributed to Henry Carey, the British (corrupted by foreign travel), have cast aside the "Manly Arts" and taken up foreign fashions, and, horror of horrors, Italian opera: "Curse on this damn'd, *Italian*, Pathic Mode/ To *Sodom* and to Hell the ready Road."<sup>1037</sup> According to Cameron McFarlane, "Italian opera is coded as sodomitical because it is a conspicuous site at which foreign culture is seen to penetrate the social body of England."<sup>1038</sup> As has been seen in Chapter 3, Lord Hervey was satirized as a 'hermaphrodite' in the Opposition journal, *The Craftsman*.<sup>1039</sup>

---

<sup>1035</sup> David F. Greenberg, "The Socio-Cultural Milieu of the Love Letters," in *Love Letters from a Certain Late Nobleman to the Famous Mr. Wilson*, ed. Michael Kimmel (New York: Harrington Park Press, 1990), 98–99.

<sup>1036</sup> McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire*, 102.

<sup>1037</sup> Henry Carey, *Faustina: Or the Roman Songstress, a Satyr, on the Luxury and Effeminacy of the Age* (London: Printed for J. Roberts, 1726), 5.

<sup>1038</sup> McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire*, 32–33.

<sup>1039</sup> *The Craftsman*, 20 Jan. 1731.

Alexander Pope caricatured him as Sporus, the youth who the Emperor Nero had castrated and then married, in the style of classical poetry.<sup>1040</sup>

In Tobias Smollett's novel *Roderick Random*, the villainous Earl Strutwell uses the authority of the ancients to persuade Roderick that sodomy is not a sin. First, he gives Roderick a copy of Petronius' *Satyricon*, and defends it, arguing that contemporary prejudice against sodomy is "more owing to prejudice and misapprehension, than to true reason and deliberation." He points out the connection to the ancients: "the best man among [them] is said to have entertained that passion; one of the wisest of their legislators has permitted the indulgence of it in his commonwealth; the most celebrated poets have not scrupled to avow it."<sup>1041</sup> Earl Strutwell also appeals, not only to the prevalence of sodomy in Eastern civilizations, but in most parts of Europe.<sup>1042</sup> At first, Roderick does not see this defense as evidence of Strutwell's notorious desires; instead, he fears that Strutwell suspects him of sodomitical desires, due to his recent travel abroad.<sup>1043</sup> It is only afterward, when his friend Banter informs him that Strutwell is 'notorious for a passion for his own sex'<sup>1044</sup> that the Earl's behavior becomes suspicious.

William Kendrick's screed against the actor David Garrick, *Love in the Suds*, (in which he insinuates that Garrick had had an affair with the disgraced dramatist Isaac Bickerstaff), is replete with references to same-sex lovers in Greek and Roman myth, and written as an

---

<sup>1040</sup> Pope, "Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot," 157.

<sup>1041</sup> Tobias George Smollett, *The Adventures of Roderick Random*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (London: Printed for J. Osborn, 1748), 175.

<sup>1042</sup> Smollett, 2:175.

<sup>1043</sup> Smollett, 2:176.

<sup>1044</sup> Smollett, 2:179.

ecologue.<sup>1045</sup> Bickerstaff's affair with a soldier, which sent him fleeing to the Continent, is described in verse, as the reason Roscius (Garrick) has lost his beloved Nyky (Bickerstaff).<sup>1046</sup> Due to the elite men who fled abroad, cities such as Florence, Naples and Paris often functioned as a shorthand for sodomy. Turkey, however, remained a favorite example. As has been seen in Chapter 2, the *Morning Chronicle* criticized the King's pardoning of Robert Jones, by ironically reporting that 'Mustapha' Drybutter had been presented to the 'Caliph', i.e. King George III.<sup>1047</sup> In 1822, the author of a pamphlet advised the disgraced Bishop of Clogher to "take a trip to Turkey, where he can worship his god without the fear of being branded or hanged."<sup>1048</sup>

### Pride, Shame and Sodomy Among the Poor.

When noted thief James Dalton published a satirical foray into London's criminal underground from Newgate Prison in 1728, he included, for comedic effect, an account of his visit to several molly houses. Dalton's mollies are shameless; before Dalton violently attempts to teach them shame, the mollies sing a song to express their pride, and rejection of the mores of their society.

Let the Fops of the Town upbraid Us, for an unnatural Trade,  
We value not Man nor Maid;  
But among our own selves we'll be free.<sup>1049</sup>

This section will consider how poor Britons transmitted and expressed shame, and how some poor sodomites managed to refuse to feel shame.

---

<sup>1045</sup> William Kendrick, *Love in the Suds; a Town Ecologue*, The Fourth Edition (London: Printed for J. Wheble, 1772).

<sup>1046</sup> Kendrick, 3.

<sup>1047</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 25 Aug. 1772. This was discussed in Chapter 2.

<sup>1048</sup> Anonymous, "The Bishop!! Particulars of the Charge Against the Hon. Percy Jocelyn, Bishop of Clogher [1822]," 353.

<sup>1049</sup> Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative*, 42.

## Shame and Sodomy among the Poor

While poor men accused of sodomy seem much less willing to commit suicide, some still did so. In 1707, Augustin Grant, a Woollen-Draper from West Smithfield, hanged himself after he had been arrested as part of a raid by the SRM; while he did not face trial, he admitted his guilt to the magistrates.<sup>1050</sup> In 1734, a former servant to the Archbishop of Canterbury, out of place with no references, cut his throat when charged with sodomitical practices.<sup>1051</sup> A private in the Artillery, stationed in Calcutta, India, tried to cut his throat when his regiment was out on exercises – he had been confined for attempting sodomy,<sup>1052</sup> and an unnamed prisoner in the Poultry Compter in 1793 tried the same, equally unsuccessfully.<sup>1053</sup> Poor sodomites were more likely to express regret or sorrow, rather than shame. The poor youths and boys who were frequently the catamites of elite and middling men, used the language of shame to avoid legal guilt. As has been seen in previous chapters, poor men and women were less likely to report sodomy occurring in their communities unless they were directly confronted with it; instead, they preferred to use shame to enforce societal norms, transmitted by means of extra-legal punishments.

### “I was Ashamed”: Poor Catamites and Shame.

One of the places where there are frequent mentions of shame is in the testimony of those who are the victims of (usually) non-consensual sodomy. In their testimony, they often discuss their feelings of shame at what has happened to them. While some mentions, such as that of John

---

<sup>1050</sup> *Post Boy*, 9-11 Oct. 1707.

<sup>1051</sup> *Daily Journal*, 12 Oct. 1734; *Grub Street Journal*, 17 Oct. 1734.

<sup>1052</sup> *Calcutta Chronicle (General Advertiser)*, 20 Aug. 1789.

<sup>1053</sup> *London Packet*, 11-13 Feb. 1793.

Mullins, seem to be polite phrases – he was ashamed to say what was done to him<sup>1054</sup> - but may sometimes be a genuine sense of shame at even talking about sodomy. Fourteen-year-old Paul Oliver was ashamed to tell the Court what Gilbert Lawrence had done to him, though he was able to tell his mother he had been ‘badly used’.<sup>1055</sup> According to Mr. Brown, James Hearne, the youth who accused Baptist preacher Charles Bradbury, was “too modest” to discuss the details of what had been done to him.<sup>1056</sup> When Joseph Churchill told his fellow apprentice Charles Horn about his experience the night before with his master’s lodger, Emmanuel ‘Old Bell’ Rozé, Horn reported that “he was ashamed to tell me [how].”<sup>1057</sup> This could also be the case for defendants: Thomas Andrews was ashamed to hear the charges uttered aloud.<sup>1058</sup>

Shame also prevented them from even reporting sodomitical assaults to the authorities. Benjamin Taylor, the twelve-year-old partner of Michael Levi, was too ashamed to tell what had been done to him, though he came forward after some other boys did so.<sup>1059</sup> In his testimony, Francis Henry Hay (also twelve), who had been sodomized by Lt Robert Jones, used the word ‘ashamed’ five times; the witnesses for the prosecution, who eventually had got Hay to admit what had happened to him, emphasized the difficulty they had had due to Hay’s sense of shame. On being questioned at the Old Bailey, Hay admitted he had not cried out – because he was ashamed. He objected to going back to Jones’ only the third time – because he was ashamed of being ill (he had had diarrhea most of the week). He told Mr. Rapley (a jeweler) before he told his uncle

---

<sup>1054</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1745, trial of John Twyford (t17450710-17).

<sup>1055</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, August 1730, trial of Gilbert Laurence (t17300828-24).

<sup>1056</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, September 1755, trial of Charles Bradbury (t17550910-42).

<sup>1057</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, February 1760, trial of Emanuel Roze (t17600227-44).

<sup>1058</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, May 1761 (t17610506-23).

<sup>1059</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, May 1751, trial of Michael Levi (t17510523-35).



because he was ashamed. When he did tell his uncle what had happened, he only told him about the first time he had been with Jones, and not of the other times (where he went willingly), because he was ashamed. He did not tell his mother, because he was ashamed. Ultimately, he admitted he felt deep shame all of the times he had sex with Jones, though he came back the additional times because Jones gave him money, and to get business for his uncle.<sup>1060</sup> Thirteen-year-old Thomas Willison, a ship's boy on the H.M.S. *Prince*, was too ashamed to tell anyone of his assault, but came forward when three other boys complained.<sup>1061</sup> George Foulston insisted that he had not told his master or his mother or step-father about what David Robertson had done to him, due to the shame; though he also took the money Robertson gave him in return for his silence.<sup>1062</sup> According to a witness at the Court Martial of John McCasky, his servant, 13-year-old Robert Walker, hid his face in shame when they were discovered.<sup>1063</sup> William Bradley (16), sworn as King's Evidence in the Court Martial of Solomon Nathan, Ship's Corporal of the *Castor*, explained that he had not reported the many times he had been involved with Nathan because he was ashamed.<sup>1064</sup>

## A Little Rough Music: Extralegal Punishments for Sodomy

While executions and the pillory were the two main judicial ways of punishing sodomy, not all cases were taken to court. Particularly in the first half of the 18th century, the poor seemed to

---

<sup>1060</sup> *Old Bailey Proceedings Online*, July 1772, trial of ROBERT JONES (t17720715-22).

<sup>1061</sup> ADM 12/26 (Court Martial of D. Jenness, 25 Aug. 1798), TNA.

<sup>1062</sup> David Robertson, *The Trial of David Robertson ... for an Unnatural Crime with George Foulston : Tried before Sir Robert Graham ... on Saturday, May 24, 1806, at Justice-Hall, in the Old Bailey : With His Remarkable Address to the Court, Praying Arrest of Judgment : Embellished with a Striking Likeness of the Prisoner* (London: Sold by J. Day., 1806), 13–14.

<sup>1063</sup> ADM 1/5390 (McCasky Court Martial, 29 December 1808), TNA.

<sup>1064</sup> ADM 1/5407 (Court Martial of S. Nathan, 9 July 1810), TNA.

prefer to take justice into their own hands. Most instances of rough music involve ‘the justice of the pump’, dunking the unfortunates under a pump, or into a nearby pond or river; in other cases, the suspected sodomite was hanged or burned in effigy, or subjected to a ritualized reenactment of the supposed crime.

David Rollinson’s research into the Gloucestershire estates of Sir Richard Holford revealed a case of sodomy treated by charivari, which he published in an article in 1981.<sup>1065</sup> Like the pillory, the charivari used shame to reinforce community moral and social standards, which the victim was believed to have transgressed. In August 1716, in the small village of Westonbirt, Gloucestershire, a labourer named Walter Lingsey reported to his fellows that he had been approached by a farmer named George Andrews (an unpopular man), who stuck his hand in Lingsey’s breeches, took him home and committed sodomy with him.<sup>1066</sup> By the end of August, the rumours had spread to all the parishes around Westonbirt; at Trewsham, near Hawkesbury, where Andrews’ father had once rented several farms, the allegations were fueled with reports that he had been “infamous for these practices formerly.”<sup>1067</sup>

By September, the people of the surrounding countryside had firmly decided that Andrews was guilty. Organized chiefly by Isaac Humphries, a local tenant farmer, the community held a Mock-Groaning, designed to shame him. Beer and meat were provided, and the town square was filled with people. Daniel Rolfe, a blacksmith from nearby Luckington, was brought in as a

---

<sup>1065</sup> David Rollison, “Property, Ideology and Popular Culture in a Gloucestershire Village, 1660-1740,” *Past & Present* 93 (Nov., 1981): 70–97.

<sup>1066</sup> John Jackson to Holford, 15 Dec. 1716. Cited in Rollison, 71.

<sup>1067</sup> *Ibid.*, cited in Rollison, 72.

consultant, having organized a similar ceremony in his own parish. They even hired a fiddler to provide the music. Lingsey was dressed in women's clothes, and, with Rolfe as midwife, was delivered of a child, "viz. a wad of straw made up and dressed with clothes in that form, wch they said was a male child." Later, they had the child christened and baptized; with one man, Samuel Wallis, pretending to be the parson, and two men standing as godfathers.<sup>1068</sup>

According to Rollison, it is likely that the matter would simply have ended with the Groaning, had not George Andrews come across William Watts (Lingsey's employer) a few days later. Andrews insisted that the Groaning had ruined his reputation and announced his intention of suing Lingsey and Watts. In response, Lingsey sought out the local justices, and charged George Andrews with sodomy.<sup>1069</sup> At his trial, on 20 March 1717, Andrews was acquitted of the charge; as the judge summed up the case to the jury, "against Andrews there appeared but one reputable person, viz. Burge, besides Watts. Lingsey, the chief party, being a vagabond, & Ball a loose fellow, as he was characterized."<sup>1070</sup>

While I have found no other references to mock-Groanings, there were many other ways to publicly express disapproval with suspected sodomites. One way particularly used when the suspected sodomite had managed to avoid justice (either by absconding, or through their wealth or position) was by hanging (or burning) the person in effigy. Reports from Bristol in 1735 announce that a "he-lady" arrested for shop-lifting 3 packs of stockings had recently been

---

<sup>1068</sup> Goodenough to Holford, 28 Nov. 1716, cited in Rollison, 73. This ritual involves many of the elements of the mollies clubs in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, described in Chapter 4.

<sup>1069</sup> Rollison, 74.

<sup>1070</sup> Jackson to Holford, 20 March 1716/17. Cited in Rollison, 79.

‘figurized’ in the public streets.<sup>1071</sup> When J.D., Esq., a man of some fortune in Banbury, Oxfordshire, compounded a light sentence for sodomitical practices with suing the evidences against him, the people of Banbury pilloried and hanged him in effigy. The effigy faced the pillory and was subsequently dragged through the streets and left on the Squire’s porch.<sup>1072</sup> Upwards of 500 women paraded the effigy of a copperman in a printing house at Stratford in 1760,<sup>1073</sup> and group of 10000 people gathered to burn a sodomite in effigy at Islington in 1772, and were only stopped when a Magistrate read them the Riot Act.<sup>1074</sup>

The most common example of community justice was dunking the person in water or dung. Bourke the barber, mentioned above, faced an element of this when an ‘Amazon’ dunked his breeches in the Kennel before whipping him with them. A man at Lincoln’s Inn was dunked there by some porters and gentlemen after the young man he was with cried out,<sup>1075</sup> and, after two men were caught together in Reading, one was scalded with cold water, then dunked in the boghouse, and then washed in stinking ditches.<sup>1076</sup> When the servant to a soap boiler at Bristol Castle was detected committing sodomitical practices with a soldier, he was dragged out of bed

---

<sup>1071</sup> *London Daily Post*, 29 July 1735.

<sup>1072</sup> The *London Evening Post*, 3 July 1755 and the *Leeds Intelligencer*, 8 July 1755 report that he was found guilty and sentenced to a month’s imprisonment and a fine of £50. He was hanged in effigy in February of 1756, according to the *Gazetteer*, 27 Feb. 1756.

<sup>1073</sup> *Lloyd’s Evening Post*, 22-24 Sept. 1760.

<sup>1074</sup> *London Evening Post*, 6-8 Aug. 1772; *Public Advertiser*, 10 Aug. 1772. The Riot Act, which came into effect 1 Aug. 1715 as a response to the Jacobite uprisings, allowed local officials to disperse any group of more than twelve people who were “unlawfully, riotously, and tumultuously assembled together.” Anyone who failed to disperse within an hour was guilty of a felony without benefit of clergy, making it a powerful tool of social control.

<sup>1075</sup> *London Post*, 20-23 June 1701.

<sup>1076</sup> *London Evening Post*, 1-3 Oct. 1728; *Daily Journal*, 3 Oct 1728; *Daily Post*, 3 Oct 1728; *Country Journal (Craftsman)*, 5 Oct. 1728; *Flying Pos*, 5 Oct. 1728; *Fog’s Weekly Journal*, 5 Oct 1728; *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 5 Oct. 1728. The newspapers do not say why only one had this fate – presumably, the other was lucky enough to escape.

and beaten through the streets. Then the butchers got hold of him, and he was thrown into the beast pens, where he was nearly suffocated in the filth.<sup>1077</sup> A fellow caught with a Gentleman's servant in a staircase at the Temple, was dragged down to the Thames, where he was tied to the stern of a boat, and dragged over to the other side of the river.<sup>1078</sup> An effeminate man who sold saloop in Ludgate hill was 'rolled in the Kennel' by some inhabitants of the Old Bailey; while it is not entirely clear what is meant by this, it is clearly unpleasant – the man barely escaped with his life.<sup>1079</sup> In addition to a number of cases of men facing the 'discipline of the pump', or the 'discipline of the Thames', there are numerous examples of men being thrown in boghouses, horse-ponds, ditches, and local rivers.<sup>1080</sup>

In some cases, men were shamed by having their nakedness shown to the public. At the court martial of Martin Billin and James Bryan, discussed in Chapter 1, the testimony of multiple witnesses revealed that, upon their discovery, Master at Arms Joshua Jones exposed Bryan's erect penis to everyone who was close by. In his own words: "I held it in my hand, and called out to the by standers, to Observe what posture they were in, and desired they would take notice."<sup>1081</sup> This served two purposes; it provided multiple witnesses to Bryan's sexual activity, but it also shamed both Bryan and Billin in front of their peers. When an elderly man was detected attempting to commit sodomy with a boy in Winchester St. in London, the crowd not only gave

---

<sup>1077</sup> *Daily Gazetteer*, 25 Jan. 1737; *Old Whig*, 27 Jan. 1737; *Read's Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 29 Jan. 1737.

<sup>1078</sup> *General Advertiser (1744)*, 21 Oct. 1751.

<sup>1079</sup> *Whitehall Evening Post*, 12-14 Dec. 1769.

<sup>1080</sup> Discipline of the Pump/Thames: *General Advertiser (1744)*, 24 Oct 1752; *London Evening Post*, 12-15 Sept. 1767. Men being ducked in a horse-pond: *London Chronicle*, 1-3 Oct. 1765; *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 2-4 Oct 1765; *Middlesex Journal*, 26-29 Aug 1769. Thrown in Rivers: *Craftsman (Say's Weekly Journal)*, 27 July 1771; *Public Advertiser*, 2 Aug. 1773.

<sup>1081</sup> ADM 1/5301 (Court Martial of Martin Billin and James Bryan, 13 May 1762), TNA.

the man a “severe ducking”, but exposed his genitals to the crowd, and threatened to cut it off if he ever attempted anything of the sort again.<sup>1082</sup> Riley and Holland, a pair of seamen aboard the HMS *Trident*, were found by White, the boatswain’s mate. He immediately summoned the master at arms, who described the scene to a court martial, “I ... found Holland between Riley’s legs. I drew them apart and found both their trousers loose, and Holland’s yard erected. I took hold of it, and said ... “White, look at this. It’s fit for action.”<sup>1083</sup>

### “Take a Pride to Have It Known”: Sodomy, the Poor, and the Rejection of Shame.

Published accounts of sodomites emphasize the rejection of social mores, particularly of marriage. Accounts such as that of Ned Ward and James Dalton, describing the activities of the mollies – emphasize their mockery of marriage, childbirth, and masculinity. By dressing as women, taking on women’s names, and appropriating the touchstones of family life, they were understood to be expressing their independence from society. That John Church, a clergyman (though a Dissenting one), performed religious marriages between men at the Swan took this even further, and combined with Church’s antinomian views, suggested the existence of a society that turned the central pillars of society upside down.<sup>1084</sup> According to Farid Azfar, the threat posed by sodomites is not that of effeminacy, but of defiant autonomy: “physically powerful, voracious men, protected by the structures of private association and secured by the

---

<sup>1082</sup> *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, 22 Oct 1772; *Morning Chronicle*, 22 Oct. 1772.

<sup>1083</sup> ADM 12/21 (Holland-Riley court martial, 11 May 1802), TNA. Holland was sentenced to 600 lashes, and Riley to 300.

<sup>1084</sup> See in particular Trumbach, “London’s Sodomites.” and Norton, *Mother Clap’s Molly House*.

weight of classical precedent.”<sup>1085</sup> With their defiant autonomy, and self-reliant marginality, the effeminate mollies are more masculine than feminine; their danger (and power) lies in the fact that they are free from shame.<sup>1086</sup> Effeminacy here, like sodomy itself, is unstable, straddling the difference between masculine and feminine, natural and unnatural, civilized and uncivilized.<sup>1087</sup>

Much of the evidence for sodomites’ pride comes from their apparent shamelessness. Thomas Hobbes had defined ‘impudence’ (which was one of the most frequent definitions for pride in contemporary dictionaries), as ‘contempt of a good reputation.’<sup>1088</sup> By refusing to accept that their actions were sinful, sodomites were showing (in the eyes of moralists and civil authorities) a contempt for decency, modesty, and good manners; by doing so in public, they showed a lack of due deference (and thus excessive pride). As observed above, the apparent shamelessness of sodomites, and whether they displayed proper shame behavior during their punishment, was a key aspect of the discourse about sodomy. While lacking shame is not necessarily the same as possessing pride, discussions of shamelessness used the same descriptors as those of pride.

For satirists like Charles Churchill, sodomy was so shameless that it was almost pride. He calls it “the Sin too proud to feel from Reason awe/ and Those, who practice it, too great for Law.”<sup>1089</sup>

While such claims are clearly reactionary, poor sodomites are reported to express some of the same defenses of sodomy used by men of the elite and middling sorts.

---

<sup>1085</sup> Azfar, “Beastly Sodomites and the Shameless Urban Future,” 403.

<sup>1086</sup> Azfar, 405.

<sup>1087</sup> McFarlane, *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire*, Chapter 1.

<sup>1088</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan: Or, The Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill* (London: Andrew Crooke, 1651), 27.

<sup>1089</sup> Charles Churchill, *Poems*, vol. 2 (n.p.: Printed in the year 1768, 1768), 270–71.

In the song James Dalton reports as being sung by ‘Miss Irons’ (a blacksmith), verses appeal to both classical history and foreign cultures.

Confusion on the Stews,  
And those that Whores do chuse,  
We’ll praise the Turks and Jews,  
Since they with us do agree,  
Since they &c.

...

Achilles that Hero great,  
Had Patroclus for a Mate;  
Nay, Jove he would have a Lad,  
The beautiful Ganymede,  
The Beautiful &c.

Why should we then  
Be daunted, when  
Both Gods and Men  
Approve the pleasant Deed,  
Approve the &c.<sup>1090</sup>

One of the men arrested in the raid on the Swan in Vere Street, felt that his sodomy was something of which he could take pride. According to Robert Holloway’s account, “a deaf tyre Smith’, one of the members of the club, has “two sons, both very handsome young men, whom he boasts are full as depraved as himself.”<sup>1091</sup>

---

<sup>1090</sup> Dalton, *A Genuine Narrative*, 42–43. While the reliability of Dalton’s narrative is suspect, the lyrics of the song acknowledge and celebrate the long history and wide appeal of sodomy, and so could ironically affirm a sodomitical identity, even while mocking it. A John Irons stood in the pillory in 1726 for sodomitical practices and may have served as the model for Miss Irons. *Daily Journal*, 20 Oct. 1726; *Evening Post*, 18–20 Oct. 1726; *Parker’s Penny Post*, 21 Oct. 1726; *British Journal*, 22 Oct. 1726; *Mist’s Weekly Journal*, 22 Oct. 1726; *Daily Journal*, 3 Nov. 1726; *Parker’s Penny Post*, 4 Nov. 1726; *British Journal*, 5 Nov. 1726; *London Journal*, 5 Nov. 1726; *London Journal*, 12 Nov. 1726; *Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*, 12 Nov. 1726; *Caledonian Journal*, 14 Nov. 1726; *Parker’s Penny Post*, 14 Nov. 1726.

<sup>1091</sup> Holloway, “The Phoenix of Sodom, Or, The Vere Street Coterie [1813],” 13.



## Conclusion

By the end of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century some important changes had occurred in the understanding of shame. The early 18<sup>th</sup> century had seen it as a tool, imposed by fear of punishment; by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, shame had become deeply felt (internalized) and sociable in nature. Likewise, the early part of the period understood shame as being crucial to the good functioning of society, as it prevented the excesses of pride, and curbed licentious behaviour. The mid-century philosophical rehabilitation of pride, reconceived as a spur to self-esteem and virtue, led to pride gaining the social value which was once held by shame.

Shame punishments, the dominant tool used in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century to punish sodomitical practices, depended on the publicity of the punishment to impose shame. Over the course of the period, as shame became increasingly internalised, the pillory as a tool became less necessary; it did not prevent sodomitical behaviour, and it placed power of punishment in the hands of a violent, sometimes deadly, crowd.

Other methods of imparting shame, such as satire, ironically spread knowledge of the literary, historical, and geographic precedents for sodomy. They spread to the broader public the knowledge possessed by those with a classical education: that sodomy had a long history, one that had been practised, tolerated, and even praised by some of the great and powerful men of history. The public punishment of sodomy, and the scandals of elite men who fled the country, likewise provided examples, as well as warnings. As a result, the 19<sup>th</sup> century turned to a policy of silence and censorship.

## Conclusion

Poet, scholar and historian John Addington Symonds died in Rome on 19 April 1893. Among his papers was the unfinished manuscript of his memoirs (begun in March 1889), which described in detail, his reflections and thoughts on his sexuality, his nature and desires. In that document, he recalled a critical moment in the spring of 1865. One night, walking home from the Century Club, he took a passage from Trafalgar to Leicester Square, one that passed some barracks. There he was accosted by a young, handsome grenadier, who suggested that they walk together.

...I liked the man's looks, felt drawn toward him, and did not refuse his company. So there I was, the slight nervous man of fashion in my dress-clothes, walking side by side with a strapping fellow in scarlet uniform, strongly attracted by his physical magnetism. From a few commonplace remarks he broke abruptly into proposals, mentioned a house we could go to, and made it quite plain for what purpose. I quickened my pace, and hurrying through the passage broke away from him with a passionate mixture of repulsion and fascination. What he offered was not what I wanted at the moment, but the thought of it stirred me deeply. The thrill of contact with the man taught me something new about myself. I can well recall the lingering regret, and the quick sense of deliverance from danger, with which I saw him fall back, after following and pleading with me for about a hundred yards. The longing left was partially a fresh seeking after comradeship and partly an animal desire the like of which I had not before experienced.<sup>1092</sup>

Summering in Bristol, Symonds managed to put the thought of the encounter from his mind. Shortly after he and his wife returned to London in the fall, however, Symonds had another experience which shook him to the core. His wife Catherine was then heavily pregnant with their eldest daughter Janet, who would be born a few weeks later.<sup>1093</sup> His marriage, which he later called “the great crime of my life”, was undertaken partly in hopes of overcoming his “abnormal

---

<sup>1092</sup> John Addington Symonds, *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds: A Critical Edition*, ed. Amber K. Regis (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 365–66.

<sup>1093</sup> Symonds married Catherine North, the daughter of Frederick North, M.P. for Hastings, on 10 Nov. 1864. Janet Symonds was born 22 October 1865.

inclinations”.<sup>1094</sup> From his marriage till that fateful day in the fall of 1865, however, “I had ceased to be assailed by what I called ‘the wolf’ – that undefined craving coloured with a vague but poignant hankering after males. I lulled myself with the belief that it would not leap on me again to wreck my happiness and disturb my studious habits.” That day, however, while walking home from Regent’s Park, he observed a crude, sexual graffiti on the wall.

It was of so concentrated, so stimulative, so penetrative a character ... that it pierced the very marrow of my soul. I must have seen a score of such *graffiti* in my time. But they had not hitherto appealed to me. Now the wolf leapt out: my malaise of the moment was converted into a clairvoyant and tyrannical appetite for the thing which I had rejected five months earlier in the alley by the barracks. The vague and morbid craving of my previous years defined itself as a precise hunger after sensual pleasure, whereof I had not dreamed before save in repulsive visions of the night. ... Inborn instincts, warped by my will and forced to take a bias contrary to my peculiar nature, reasserted themselves with violence. I did not recognize the phenomenon as a temptation. It appeared to me, just what it was, the resurrection of a chronic torment which had been some months in abeyance.<sup>1095</sup>

Looking back on the incident from the vantage point of nearly a quarter-century’s experience, Symonds observed that

that obscene *graffito* was the sign and symbol of a paramount and permanent craving of my physical and psychical nature. It connected my childish reveries with the mixed passions and audacious comradeship of my maturity. Not only my flesh, but my heart also, was involved in the emotion which it stirred. The awakening spasm of desire had little to do with either fancy or will as the return of neuralgia in a sudden throb of agony. God help me! I cried. I felt humiliated, frightened, gripped in the clutch of doom. Nothing remained but to parry, palliate, procrastinate. There was no hope of escape. And all the while the demon ravished my imagination with ‘the love of the impossible.’ Hallucinations of the senses crowded in upon my brain together with the pangs of shame and the prevision of inevitable woes. From this decisive moment forward to the end, my life had to fly on a broken wing, and my main ambition has been to constitute a working compromise.<sup>1096</sup>

---

<sup>1094</sup> Symonds, *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds*, 363.

<sup>1095</sup> Symonds, 366–67.

<sup>1096</sup> Symonds, 366–67.

Too terrified to indulge in his desires, Symonds threw himself into writing poems “illustrating the love of man for man in all periods of civilization”; poems he knew would never be published. The writing, however, kept him “in a continual state of *orexis*, or irritable longing. ... The writing of these poems was a kind of mental masturbation.”<sup>1097</sup> It took him many years, but eventually he found what he was looking for: “I found the affirmation of religion and contentment in love – not the human kindly friendly love, which I had given liberally to my beloved wife and children, my father and my sister and my companions, but in the passionate sexual love of comrades.”<sup>1098</sup>

The homosexual underworld at which Symonds found himself at the edges had evolved from the sodomitical subculture of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century. The emotional turmoil and confusion stirred by his awareness of his sexual nature likewise connected him with the emotional discourses of the preceding century. The ways that he understood his sexuality, however, while they shared aspects with elite sodomites of the past, came to be heavily shaped by sexology and psychology of the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Symonds’ writings, in turn, would prove influential on the writers and activists of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. E.M. Forster wrote in 1912 that he “felt nearer to [Symonds] than any man” that he had ever read about. They shared many things: education, health, literary interests, outlooks and interests, and above all, sexual desire for men. Like Byron

---

<sup>1097</sup> Symonds, 367–68.

<sup>1098</sup> Symonds, 343.

earnestly desired to read Beckford's unpublished *Tales of Vathek*, Forster desperately wished to read the full memoirs; unlike Byron, he was granted this wish.<sup>1099</sup>

This thesis has examined how the emotional reactions to sodomy in the long 18<sup>th</sup> century resulted in a situation where, as Symonds observed, it was widely believed that “a male who loves his own sex must be despicable, degraded, depraved, vicious, and incapable of humane or generous sentiments.”<sup>1100</sup> It has done so through consideration of six sets of paired emotions: lust and disgust, love and hatred, hope and fear, gratitude and anger, joy and sadness, and pride and shame. Changes in law, gender norms, shifts in religious and philosophical thought, the rise of sentimentalism, evangelism, nationalism and the middle-class combined in myriad ways to lead to this common perception.

In the first chapter, lust and disgust, I have shown how during the long 18<sup>th</sup> century, understandings of desire became tied to understandings of nature, and thus, some types of lust were considered ‘natural’, and lost much of the moral disapproval they had once carried, while others, the ‘unnatural’, became the increasing target of moral disgust. Since sodomy was a felony, it also necessitated secrecy, and was often reduced to commercial, rather than emotional relationships. As well, the difficulty finding safe spaces to engage in sexual behaviour led many sodomites to seek out places that were regularly considered places of disgust: fields filled with manure, outhouses, dark trash-filled alleyways, barns, kennels and pigpens. The moral disgust was expressed by associating both the act of sodomy and the sodomite themselves with objects

---

<sup>1099</sup> *The Journals and Diaries of E.M. Forster*, ed. Philip Gardner, vol. 2, The Pickering Masters (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011), 35. Forster was required to wait many years but was finally able to read the MS in the 1960s.

<sup>1100</sup> Symonds, *Male Love*, 88.

of revulsion. This was done both in language, and through legal and extra-legal forms of punishment. The other way this disgust was expressed was by making the topic taboo, and the social ostracism of anyone thought to be associated with it. By the 19<sup>th</sup> century, this process had become internalised. In his memoirs, Symonds recorded one of his earliest experiences with sex. Even though he had had erotic dreams of handsome naked sailors since early childhood, his first experience revealed both lust and an internalized disgust at the physical manifestation of sexuality. He later observed in his memoirs, that “the attractions of a dimly divined almost mystic sensuality persisted in my nature, side by side with a marked repugnance to lust in action, throughout my childhood and boyhood down to an advanced stage of manhood.”<sup>1101</sup> As was seen in his reaction to the soldier, quoted above, he found his experiences with sex both arousing and repulsive.

This disgust was also crucial in helping form hatred against sodomites. The second chapter, love and hatred, examined how sodomites tried to fit love into their relationships by using the language of existing relational frameworks, such as marriage, friendship, patronage, and religion, to express their love relatively openly. Conversely, the hatred generated by disgust and fear combined was evoked in defence of those existing frameworks to justify acts of extreme violence against sodomites, whether convicted, accused or merely suspected. For the middling ranks, hatred of sodomy was particularly virulent, as religion and domesticity became central to their emerging class-identity. Sodomites of the middling and elite ranks tried to protect themselves

---

<sup>1101</sup> Symonds, *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds*, 100.

from this hatred by divorcing their sexual and emotional lives: sex was achieved in secrecy, with men and boys they could control; love was sensual and romantic, but not necessarily sexual.

This was the ‘working compromise’ that Symonds tried to find in his life, limiting his sexual life to his wife, but engaging in a series of intense romantic friendships with young men, modelled on the examples of Greek history. Reading Plato for the first time in the summer of 1858, he saw “the possibility of resolving in the practical harmony the discords of my inborn instincts. I perceived that masculine love had its virtue as well as its vice, and stood in this respect upon the same ground as normal sexual appetite.”<sup>1102</sup> Eventually, when he fell in love with ‘Norman’ in 1868, he recognized that this compromise did not work for him, discussed the situation with his wife, and resolved on a celibate marriage. He observed that he and his wife “have grown to be closer friends and better companions in proportion as we eliminated sex from our life.” This compromise still had its problems. “She could not help being jealous of Norman, especially when she found some letters written by me to him in strains of passion I had never used to her. On my side, I was exposed to perturbations of the senses and the inconveniences of sexual abstinence while encouraging my love for Norman... I did not break the promise I had made and though I desired him sensuously, I slipped into nothing base.”<sup>1103</sup>

Symonds knew firsthand how deep the hatred of sodomites ran. As a school boy at Harrow, he had witnessed as ‘fags’, younger students who acted as personal servants to older ones, were beaten, kicked, and spat upon for having been sexually abused.<sup>1104</sup> His first year at Oxford, he

---

<sup>1102</sup> Symonds, 152.

<sup>1103</sup> Symonds, 393.

<sup>1104</sup> Symonds, 143.

confided to a friend (and fellow homosexual), that a former Harrow classmate of his was involved with Dr. Vaughan, the school's headmaster. His friend, John Conington, the Corpus Christi College professor of Latin, insisted that Symonds tell his father. As a result of this, his father blackmailed Headmaster Vaughan into resigning from Harrow, and then hounded him from post to post, position to position.<sup>1105</sup> In his will, Dr. Vaughan asked that his posthumous 'life', commonly issued on the death of a distinguished Victorian, not be written.<sup>1106</sup>

The third chapter considers four emotions: hope, fear, gratitude and anger. Fear of sodomites was used to justify anger against them; living in constant fear made hope difficult, leading to sadness and despair; and as the language of 'nature' became increasingly dominant, sodomy was increasingly framed as ingratitude to women, to nature, and to society. As well, elite and middling sodomites often used gratitude in sexual encounters with men of a lower social status, either with the promise of gratitude, should their desires be met, or in return for silence. While sodomites were justifiably afraid of danger, disgrace and even death should their desires become known, their desires were framed as acts of violence. Violent reactions to the presence of sodomy, which could result in grave physical harm, and even the death, of the sodomite, were socially and legally justified as natural responses to fear. For catamites, fear and shame were frequently given to explain their consent, or their failure to report an act of violation. Hope was frequently held out by magistrates in exchange for information against sodomites' former lovers;

---

<sup>1105</sup> Symonds, 150, Chap. 6.

<sup>1106</sup> Naomi Wolf, *Outrages: Sex, Censorship, and the Criminalization of Love* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2019), 68, 383. While Wolf's book is rife with historical errors, she is correct about the emotional impact of the treatment of homosexuality on 19<sup>th</sup> century men such as Symonds.



at the same time, rhetoric emphasized God's wrath upon sodomites and the country in which they lived.

In the passages from Symonds' memoirs, quoted above, he describes how the solicitations of the soldier in the alley filled him with terror, and caused him to flee the man's presence. His recognition that these desires were recurring, that they were a part of his nature that even marriage to a wonderful woman could not alleviate, caused in him hopeless fear, and a sense of doom. This sense of doom, and fear of his own self, was taught to him in Bristol in the 1840s, in the Chapel of the Blind Asylum, and in the house of his grandmother, in whose house he heard "nothing of the Gospel or the love of Christ for the whole human race" but internalized his grandmother's belief that "all who lived outside the ... fold were children of wrath."<sup>1107</sup> Unlike the emphasis on love stressed by the early Methodists and the Antinomian John Church, evangelical religion for Symonds involved an indictment of human nature, and an emphasis on sin and God's wrath. This, in his view, led to a terrible fear of his own nature, of his own desires; terrors which were not easily thrown away.

The rise of both sentimentalism and evangelism led to the increasing conflation of happiness and joy to the domestic, and particularly to the presence and influence of women. This in turn sentenced sodomites to an inability to ever truly be happy. Sadness was thus an inherent part of sodomitical desire. For elite sodomites, this sadness could be expressed as proof of sensitivity, and, as grief, deep, romantic love could be openly expressed between two men in ways that were

---

<sup>1107</sup> Symonds, *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds*, 73.

otherwise socially impossible. In 18<sup>th</sup> century moral thought, compassion (or sadness for the pain of other people) was essential to moral participation in society. It became tied to love of society, and of mankind. As with happiness and love, it became tied to ‘nature’ and domesticity, and thus something that sodomites were incapable of feeling.

In his first year at Oxford, his friend John Conington told him of other men, like them, who were determined to live by the Platonic ideals of virtuous, chaste male love. He gave Symonds a volume of poetry, *Ionica*, and Symonds learned of the love-story of its author William Johnson Cory, and his pupil, Charlie Wood, Lord Halifax. For Symonds, the poetry, and its author’s story, “went straight to [his] heart and inflamed [his] imagination.”<sup>1108</sup> Symonds even wrote a letter to Johnson, telling him of his own feelings, and asking his advice. Johnson answered, with a “long epistle upon pederastia in modern times, defending it, and laying down the principle that affection between persons of the same sex is no less natural and rational than the ordinary passionate relations.” Despite this, Symonds detected a “wistful yearning sadness – the note of disappointment and forced abstention.” From the perspective of years’ experience, he observed that he had never “found this note absent in lovers of my sort and Johnson’s.”<sup>1109</sup> The cultural association of sodomy with sadness and illness caused Symonds to feel, in his realization of his nature in 1865, quoted above, that his love was impossible, and he doomed to inevitable woe.

The final chapter considered the emotions of pride and shame. It looked at how shame was created by legal and social punishments, through expressions of disgust and hatred, through

---

<sup>1108</sup> Symonds, 170.

<sup>1109</sup> Symonds, 170–71.

social disgrace not only to the sodomite themselves, but to everyone who loved and supported them. It was done through social isolation, harassment, and mockery. Mockery through satire, however, also worked to create pride. Elite sodomites drew on literary, geographical and historical examples to create a sense of history and feel pride in themselves. Middling sodomites tended to draw on elite references, while poorer sodomites insisted on their right to bodily autonomy.

Symonds' experiences with pride and shame demonstrate the changes of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century perhaps more explicitly than any of the other emotions discussed so far. Unlike the sodomites of the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, who required the punishment of the pillory or the pump to impart shame, Symonds felt it deeply on the very recognition of his nature. At the same time, however, the example of the Greeks, as well as other men with similar tastes and leanings, helped him develop a sense of self-identity. In his academic career, he focussed on the powerful potential of male love for virtue – his key works were on Plato, Greek love, and of the great figures of history, such as Michelangelo and Cellini, who loved men as he did, and of contemporaries, such as Walt Whitman.

This dissertation has also explored some of the massive legal, social, and cultural changes which occurred over the course of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century and divided the worlds of the Earl of Rochester from John Addington Symonds. Legally, the development of the SRMs in the wake of the Glorious Revolution of 1689 had enormous ramifications for the legal prosecution of sex crimes, particularly sodomy. The innovations of the Naval laws of the Commonwealth and Restoration period were extended in the 1720s to the common law, creating a *de facto* crime of 'attempted sodomy' which had a dramatic impact on the policing and prosecution of sodomitical activity.

The increasing expansion of policing and magistracy ensured that, even after the decline of the SRMs, sodomitical activities were still prosecuted and dealt with severely. The introduction of increasingly severe punishments for blackmail and extortion throughout this period points to the concern of the governing elite that the increase of prosecution of sodomy and sodomitical attacks could be used against men of property by men of lower rank. Similarly, the eventual elimination of the pillory and even the exercise of the death penalty for cases of sodomy point, not to a diminution in the social opprobrium to the crime, but to a desire to consolidate state control of punishment; at the pillory, and even at the gallows, the public were far too powerful, and difficult to control. Similarly, the shame and fear which these punishments imparted were no longer necessary; these emotions had been internalised.

Feeding the changes in the law which led so many more men to be prosecuted for sodomitical crimes were changes in gender norms and expectations. The rise of companionate marriage, domesticity, and virtuous womanhood led to a decline in socially accepted male intimacy. The 17<sup>th</sup> century model of gender, where age, rank and sex determined expected gender roles and gendered behaviour, became replaced by one based on separate sex and gender roles for men and women. Similarly, over the course of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century understandings of women's sexuality changed from being inherently lustful to being essentially asexual. Qualities which had been used by men to demonstrate their social position, such as dress and public expressions of affection and desire, were shifted to women, and became part of the 'natural' differences between the sexes. This process was also influenced by the greater awareness of sodomy as a set of behaviours, which furthered the decline of physical expressions of friendship and desire between men.

Changes in religion and philosophy also played a role in the changing understanding of sodomy during this period. The institution of (Protestant) religious toleration in the wake of the Glorious Revolution largely broke down the old trinity of heresy, sodomy and witchcraft (though elements of it remained in homophobic discourse and stereotypes, as they do still). Rather than other Protestant sects being heretics (who were of course, guilty of sodomy and witchcraft), they were now partners in a national quest for religious purity. The rise of Methodism with its emphasis on feeling (particularly love) provided religious frameworks for men to express deep love and companionship with their fellow man; however, as Methodism grew more respectable and established, it absorbed much of the hostility of other evangelical sects.

The emotions of happiness and pride were transformed in popular thought to suit the needs of an increasingly prosperous mercantile nation. Once only achievable after death, happiness became the emotion of contentment, of prosperity, of society. Through sentimentalism, this happiness became embodied in conjugal marriage to a virtuous woman; love was increasingly defined as the union of friendship and sexual desire which could only be properly expressed in marriage between man and woman. Pride, one of the seven deadly sins, became self-esteem, and was deemed essential to civic life and virtue, properly channelled through manners and taste. Sentimentalism was spread from philosophy through the media of the novel, poetry, and art. Properly channelled emotions, of love, appreciation of beauty, compassion and sociability became tied to concepts of the 'natural', and so, by definition, excluded the sodomitical.

The rise of the middling ranks, and the emergence, towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, of the middle class, increasingly tied virtue to respectability, piety, and domesticity. This led to their involvement in civic projects such as the SRMs, and its later successors, but also to their active

persecution and prosecution of sodomy and vilification of sodomites. Over the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, they increasingly put pressure on the elite, calling into question their virtue (and thus right to social and political power). Elites responded by absorbing many of the values and priorities of the middling ranks, including social ostracism and persecution of men suspected of sodomitical affections.

This dissertation has contributed to the existing historiography of sexuality and of the emotions. It is unique in its scope, examining twelve emotions over an almost 140-year period. By looking at these emotions in relation to a single topic, sodomy, this project has considered how these emotions combined and varied based on context. This approach also enriches historical understanding of the affective life of sodomites and their interactions with their society.

Due to the broad scope, however, my analysis limited its analysis of different emotional communities to those of socio-economic rank. While I attempted to show the variations of thought and opinion based on gender, age, education and religion, I was only able to do so in the broadest of strokes. Similarly, the continuity and change of how each emotion was experienced was limited to general trends. Further research remains to be done on these variations, and individual case studies, done from the perspective of the history of emotions, will allow for more precise examination of individual emotional communities.

## Bibliography

### Abbreviations

BL – British Library

Bod – Bodleian Library, Oxford

BPRO – Bristol Public Record Office

CUL – Cambridge University Library

LMA – London Metropolitan Archives

LT – Libraries Tasmania

NLS - National Library of Scotland

NMM – National Maritime Museum

SRANSW – State Records Authority of New South Wales

TNA – The National Archives

### Primary Sources

#### Archival Sources and Unpublished Primary Sources

##### **Bodleian Library, Oxford**

*Bod.MS Eng.C.3190 fols 65, 66*

*Bod Gough Norfolk 43*

##### **Bristol Public Record Office**

*BPRO JQS-P (68)*

*BPRO JQS-P (257, 261-265, 267, 269-270, 277, 283, 286, 288)*

*BPRO QS F (28-30)*

*BPRO QS (18-20)*

*BPRO QS 2 (20-24, 45)*

*BPRO QS 20 (26)*

**British Library***BL Add MSS 75899-75900 Althorp Papers vol. dxcix, dc***Libraries Tasmania***CON 31/1/6/P178***London Metropolitan Archives***MJ/SP/1696/05 (25)**MJ/SP/1698/12 (23-25)**MJ/SP/1706/07 (53-54)**MJ/SP/1706/10 (47-48)**MJ/SP/1709/7 (1-2)**MJ/SP/1716/12/8**MJ/SP/1726/10/1a**MJ/SP/1727/05/20**MJ/SP/1730/10/17**MJ/SP/1732/08-09**MJ/SP/1747/01**MJ/SP/1747/12 (70-72)**MJ/SP/1760/10 (78)**MJ/SP/1760/10 (90)**MJ/SP/1773/10 (38)**MJ/SP/1786/04 (345)**MJ/SP/1791/11/6**MJ/SP/1810/06 (3-4)**MJ/SP/1826/09 (138)**MJ/SP/1827/05 (131)**MJ/SP/1827/09 (146)**MJ/SP/1827/09 (152)**OB/SP/1772/07/15-18**OB/SP/1774/07/002***National Archives***ADM 1/89**ADM 1/412**ADM 1/653**ADM 1/853**ADM 1/924**ADM 1/1219**ADM 1/1517**ADM 1/2406**ADM 1/2427**ADM 1/5257**ADM 1/5262**ADM 1/5265-5266**ADM 1/5296**ADM 1/5298**ADM 1/5300-5302**ADM 1/5339**ADM 1/5343**ADM 1/5350**ADM 1/5369**ADM 1/5383*



<i>ADM 1/5397</i>	<i>HO 26/20/78</i>
<i>ADM 1/5399</i>	<i>HO 26/31/173</i>
<i>ADM 1/5403</i>	<i>HO 27/2/97</i>
<i>ADM 1/5407</i>	<i>HO 27/6/9</i>
<i>ADM 1/5452</i>	<i>HO 27/6/62</i>
<i>ADM 1/5453</i>	<i>HO 27/6/106</i>
<i>ADM 1/5473</i>	<i>HO 27/6/168</i>
<i>ADM 12/21</i>	<i>HO 27/7/9</i>
<i>ADM 12/24</i>	<i>HO 27/7/190</i>
<i>ADM 12/26</i>	<i>HO 27/10/190</i>
<i>ADM 12/27</i>	<i>HO 27/19/355</i>
<i>ADM 51/219</i>	<i>HO 27/24/310</i>
<i>ADM 51/283</i>	<i>HO 40/87/657-658</i>
<i>ADM 51/722</i>	<i>HO 40/99/214-215, 366-367</i>
<i>ADM 51/1264</i>	<i>HO 42/109/18-21</i>
<i>ADM 51/2606</i>	<i>HO 42/125/132, 514</i>
<i>ADM 51/3843</i>	<i>HO 42/127/107</i>
<i>ADM 102/12</i>	<i>HO 42/129/28</i>
<i>ADM 103/468</i>	<i>HO 42/141/406-413</i>
<i>ADM 103/476</i>	<i>HO 47/5/71</i>
<i>HO 10/18/26</i>	<i>HO 47/6/54, 322, 422-424</i>
<i>HO 10/55/397</i>	<i>HO 47/11/29, 261-64, 270-282</i>
<i>HO 11/1/23</i>	<i>HO 47/33/22</i>
<i>HO 13/7/465</i>	<i>HO 47/59/1</i>
<i>HO 13/28/31-34, 369-371</i>	<i>HO 47/69/2</i>
<i>HO 13/31/79-80</i>	<i>HO 77/2/78</i>
<i>HO 17/6/8</i>	<i>HO 77/2-7, 9-19, 21-23, 26-30, 32, 34-35</i>
<i>HO 17/30/160</i>	<i>PC 1/3455</i>
<i>HO 17/40/44</i>	<i>PCOM 2/176/4</i>
<i>HO 26/3/36</i>	<i>PCOM 2/187/239</i>
<i>HO 26/16/10</i>	<i>PRO 30/28/8</i>

*PROB 11/1232/67*

*SP 35/61/18, 194*

*SP 35/62/1 f.11, 13, 33, 50*

*SP 36/13/129*

*SP 36/20/2 ff.7-8a, 10-12a, 24-26*

*SP 36/44 ff 93a -99*

*SP 36/45 ff. 99a-103*

*SP 36/46 f/ 109a-110, 103a-106, 106a-109a*

*SP 36/46/1, f.97, 100*

*SP 37/8 f.87*

*SP 37/0 f.188*

*SP 42/7/145*

*SP 44/7/145*

*SP 44/87 f. 34-35, 200*

*SP 44/91 f.155, 165*

*SP 44/105 f. 122a*

*SP 44/347 f.55*

*SP 44/365 f. 133*

*SP 44/376 f.20*

*SP 44/377 f.331*

*SP 46/151 f.188*

*TS 11/506/1660*

*Y/ORD/1/1/17*

*Y/ORD/1/1/33, 37*

### **National Maritime Museum**

*ADM/A/1860/15, 17*

*ADM/A/1860/97*

*ADM/B/161/37*

### **State Record Authority of New South Wales**

*NRS 1155 Reel 2425-443*

*NRS 12188 Reel 397-248*

### **Newspapers and Journals**

*Aberdeen Journal*

*Adam's Weekly Courant (Chester)*

*Annual Register*

*Antigua Journal*

*Applebee's Original Weekly Journal*

*Argus*

*Arminian Magazine*

*Bath Chronicle*

*Belfast Commercial Chronicle*

*Bell's Life in London (Sporting Chronicle)*

*Bell's Weekly Messenger*

*Bermuda Gazette*

*Berrow's Worcester Journal*

*Bingley's Journal*

<i>Brice's Weekly Journal (Exeter)</i>	<i>Dublin Courier</i>
<i>Bristol Mercury</i>	<i>Dublin Evening Post</i>
<i>Bristol Mirror</i>	<i>Dublin Morning Post</i>
<i>British Journal</i>	<i>Dublin Weekly Register</i>
<i>British Spy (New Universal London Weekly)</i>	<i>E. Johnson's British Gazette</i>
<i>British Volunteer</i>	<i>Echo (Edinburgh Weekly Journal)</i>
<i>Britannic Magazine</i>	<i>English Chronicle</i>
<i>Bury and Norwich Post</i>	<i>English Post</i>
<i>Calcutta Chronicle</i>	<i>Evangelical Magazine</i>
<i>Caledonian Mercury</i>	<i>Evening Post</i>
<i>Cambridge Chronicle</i>	<i>Examiner</i>
<i>Carlisle Journal</i>	<i>Exeter Flying Post</i>
<i>Champion (Evening Advertiser)</i>	<i>Felix Farley's Bristol Journal</i>
<i>Chester Chronicle (North Wales Advertiser)</i>	<i>Flying Post (The Post Master)</i>
<i>Chester Courant</i>	<i>Flying Post (Weekly Medley)</i>
<i>Cobbett's Weekly Political Register</i>	<i>Fog's Weekly Journal</i>
<i>Common Sense (Englishman's Journal)</i>	<i>Freeholder's Journal</i>
<i>Country Journal (the Craftsman)</i>	<i>Gazetteer (New Daily Advertiser)</i>
<i>Courier</i>	<i>General Advertiser (1744)</i>
<i>Covent Garden Journal</i>	<i>General Advertiser (1784)</i>
<i>Coventry Herald</i>	<i>General Advertiser (Morning Intelligencer)</i>
<i>Cowdroy's Manchester Gazette</i>	<i>General Evening Post</i>
<i>Craftsman (Say's Weekly Journal)</i>	<i>General London Evening Mercury</i>
<i>Cumberland Paquet</i>	<i>Gentlemen's Magazine</i>
<i>Daily Advertiser</i>	<i>Globe</i>
<i>Daily Courant</i>	<i>Gloucester Journal</i>
<i>Daily Gazetteer</i>	<i>Grub Street Journal</i>
<i>Daily Journal</i>	<i>Hampshire Chronicle</i>
<i>Daily Post</i>	<i>Hampshire Telegraph</i>
<i>Derby Mercury</i>	<i>Hereford Journal</i>
<i>Diary (Woodfall's Register)</i>	<i>Hibernian Journal</i>

<i>Hull Packet</i>	<i>London Daily Post</i>
<i>Ipswich Journal</i>	<i>London Evening Post</i>
<i>Jacobites Journal</i>	<i>London Evening Standard</i>
<i>Jesuite</i>	<i>London Gazetteer</i>
<i>Kentish Chronicle</i>	<i>London Journal</i>
<i>Kentish Gazette</i>	<i>London Morning Advertiser</i>
<i>Kentish Weekly Journal</i>	<i>London Morning Penny Post</i>
<i>Kentish Weekly Post</i>	<i>London Packet</i>
<i>Ladies' Magazine</i>	<i>London Post</i>
<i>Lancaster Gazette</i>	<i>London Spy Revived</i>
<i>Leeds Intelligencer</i>	<i>Manchester Mercury</i>
<i>Leeds Mercury</i>	<i>Middlesex Journal</i>
<i>Leicester Chronicle</i>	<i>Mirror of the Times</i>
<i>Leicester Journal</i>	<i>Mist's Weekly Journal</i>
<i>Liverpool Mercury</i>	<i>Monthly Chronicle</i>
<i>Lloyd's Evening Post (British Chronicle)</i>	<i>Morning Advertiser</i>
<i>London Advertiser</i>	<i>Morning Chronicle</i>
<i>London and Country Journal</i>	<i>Morning Herald</i>
<i>London Chronicle</i>	<i>Morning Post</i>
<i>London Courier</i>	<i>National Journal</i>
<i>New England Courant</i>	<i>Nottingham Journal</i>
<i>New Morning Post</i>	<i>Observer</i>
<i>Newcastle Courant</i>	<i>Old England</i>
<i>Norfolk Chronicle</i>	<i>Old Whig (Consistent Protestant)</i>
<i>Northampton Mercury</i>	<i>Oracle</i>
<i>Norwich Gazette</i>	<i>Original London Post (Heathcote's Intelligencer)</i>
<i>Norwich Mercury</i>	<i>Original Weekly Journal</i>
<i>Owen's Weekly Chronicle</i>	<i>Parker's London News (Impartial Intelligencer)</i>
<i>Oxford Journal</i>	<i>Parker's Penny Post</i>
<i>Oxford University and City Herald</i>	<i>Penny London Morning Advertiser</i>
<i>Parker's General Advertiser</i>	

*Penny London Post*

*Post Angel*

*Post Boy*

*Post Man*

*Public Advertiser*

*Public Ledger*

*The Rambler*

*Reading Mercury and Oxford Gazette*

*Remembrancer (1747)*

*Royal Cornwall Gazette, Falmouth Packet  
& Plymouth Journal*

*Royal Gazette (Bermuda)*

*Salisbury and Winchester Journal*

*Saunders' Newsletter (Dublin)*

*Schofield's Middlewich Journal (Cheshire  
Advertiser)*

*Scotsman*

*Sheffield Independent*

*Shrewsbury Chronicle*

*Southampton Herald*

*Spirit of the Public Journals*

*St. James' Chronicle*

*St. James' Evening Post*

*Staffordshire Advertiser*

*Stamford Mercury*

*Standard*

*Star*

*Statesman*

*Suffolk Chronicle*

*Sun*

*Sunday Times*

*Sussex Advertiser*

*Taunton Courier*

*Telegraph*

*Times*

*Town and Country Magazine*

*True Briton (1793)*

*Universal Chronicle (Weekly Gazette)*

*Universal Chronicle (Westminster Journal)*

*Universal Journal*

*Universal London Morning Advertiser*

*Universal Magazine*

*Universal Spectator (Weekly Journal)*

*Universal Spy*

*Weekly Journal (British Gazetteer)*

*Weekly Journal (Saturday Post)*

*Weekly Medley*

*Weekly Miscellany (1732)*

*Weekly Packet*

*Weekly Register*

*Westminster Journal*

*Wheeler's Manchester Chronicle*

*Whitehall Evening Post*

*Worcester Journal*

*World*

*York Herald*

## Online Databases

Devereaux, Simon. *Capital Convictions at the Old Bailey, 1730-1827*. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria. <http://hcmc.uvic.ca/project/oldbailey/index.php>.

Hitchcock, Tim, Robert Shoemaker, Sharon Howard and Jamie McLaughlin, *et al.*, *London Lives, 1690-1800*. [www.londonlives.org](http://www.londonlives.org), version 1.1, 24 April 2012.

Hitchcock, Tim, Robert Shoemaker, Clive Emsley, Sharon Howard and Jamie McLaughlin, *et al.*, *The Old Bailey Proceedings Online, 1674-1913*. [www.oldbaileyonline.org](http://www.oldbaileyonline.org), version 7.0, 24 March 2012.

## Published Primary Sources

### Autobiography, Biography & Memoirs.

Boswell, James. *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Edited by Ernest Rhys. Everyman's Library. 2 vols. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co, 1913.

Burnet, Gilbert. *Some Passages of the Life and Death of the Right Honourable John, Earl of Rochester*. Edited by Lord Ronald Charles Gower. London: Eliot Stock, 1875.

Byron, George Gordon and Thomas Moore. *Life, Letters and Journal of Lord Byron*. London: John Murray, 1839.

----- *The Works of Lord Byron: With his Letters and Journals, and his Life*. London: John Murray, 1835.

Charnock, John. *Biographia Navalis: Or, Impartial Memoirs of the Lives and Characters of Officers of the Navy of Great Britain: From the Year 1660 to the Present Time*. London: R. Faulder, 1795.

Church, John. *The Foundling; or, the Child of Providence*. Printed for the Author, and sold at the Surrey Tabernacle. London: R. Weston, 1823.

Cook, William. *Memoirs of Samuel Foote, Esq. with a Collection of his Genuine Bon-Mots, Anecdotes, Opinions, &c.* 2 Vols. London: R. Philips, 1805.

Coxe, William. *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of Sir Robert Walpole, Earl of Orford*. 3 vols. London: Cadell and Davies, 1798.

Gray, Thomas and William Mason. *The Poems of Mr. Gray, to which are Prefixed Memoirs of his Life and Writings*. York: Printed by A. Ward, 1775.

Hervey, John Hervey Baron. *Some Materials Towards Memoirs of the Reign of King George II.* Edited by Romney Sedgwick. Reprint of the 1931 Edition. 3 Vols. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Lansdown, Henry Venn. *Recollections of the Late William Beckford of Fonthill, Wilts and Lansdown, Bath [1893].* Edited by Charlotte Lansdown. Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition. Project Gutenberg, 2006.

*Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Thomas Deveil, Knight, One of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace.* London: M. Cooper, 1748.

Richardson, John. *Recollections, Political, Literary, Dramatic and Miscellaneous, of the Last Half-Century.* London: Printed for the Author by Savill & Edwards, 1855.

Symonds, John Addington. *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds: A Critical Edition.* Edited by Amber K. Regis. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Tagart, Edward and Peter Heywood. *A Memoir of the Late Captain Peter Heywood, R.N., with Extracts from his Diaries and Correspondence.* London: Effingham Wilson, 1832.

Toynbee, Paget (ed). *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West and Ashton.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915.

### **Diaries, Journals & Correspondence.**

Beckford, William. *The Journal of William Beckford in Portugal and Spain, 1787-1788.* Edited by Boyd Alexander. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954.

----- *Life at Fonthill, 1807-1822, with Interludes in Paris and London.* Edited by Boyd Alexander. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1957.

Byron, George Gordon. "Byron's Correspondence. 02. Mediterranean 1809-1811." Edited by Peter Cochran. June 2012.

<https://petercochran.files.wordpress.com/2009/02/02-mediterranean-1809-181126.pdf>.

----- *Byron's Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of All the Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of all others.* Edited by Leslie A. Marchand. 13 vols. London: J. Murray, 1973.

----- *The Works of Byron: Letters and Journals.* Edited by Rowland E. Prothero. Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition. 6 vols. Project Gutenberg, 2011.

Carter, Elizabeth. *Letters from Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, to Mrs. Montagu, Between the Years 1755 and 1800.* Edited by Rev. Montagu Pennington. 4 vols. London: F.C. and J. Rivington, 1817.

Church, John. *The Voice of Faith in the Valley of Achor [1820].* Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition. 2 vols. Project Gutenberg, 2019.

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Edited by William Bray. 2 vols. London: M. Walter Dunne, 1901.

Farington, Joseph. *The Farington Diary*. Edited by James Grieg. Vol.6: Jan. 1810-June 1811. London: Hutchinson, 1926.

Forster, E.M. *The Journals and Diaries of E.M. Forster*. Edited by Philip Gardner. Vol. 2. The Pickering Masters. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2011.

Fortescue, Sir John (ed). *The Correspondence of King George the Third*. Vol. 2. London: Macmillan and Co., 1927.

Gray, Thomas and William Mason. *The Letters of Thomas Gray, Including the Correspondence of Gray and Mason*. Edited by Duncan C. Tovey. 3 Vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1900.

Hervey, John. *Lord Hervey and His Friends, 1726-38: based on letters from Holland House, Melbury and Ickworth*. Edited by Giles Stephen Holland Fox-Strangeways, Lord Ilchester. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. London: J. Murray, 1950.

Nelson, Horatio. *The Dispatches and Letters of Vice Admiral Lord Viscount Nelson*. Edited by Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. 7 vols. London: H. Colburn, 1845.

Piozzi, Hester Thrale. *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi) 1776-1809*. Edited by Katherine Canby Balderston. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Edited by Frederick Jones. 2 Vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Tovey, Duncan C. (ed). *Gray and His Friends: Letters and Relics in Great Part Hitherto Unpublished*. Cambridge: University Press, 1890.

Vernon, James. *Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III from 1696 to 1708, addressed to the Duke of Shrewsbury*. 3 Vols. London: Henry Colborn, 1841.

Wilson, Thomas. *The Diaries of Thomas Wilson, D.D., 1731-37 and 1750: Son of Bishop Wilson of Sodor & Man*. Edited by Charles Lawrence Scruton Linell. London: S.P.C.K, 1964.

Walpole, Horace. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*. Edited by W.S. Lewis. Digital Collection. 48 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937-83.

### **Dictionaries, Encyclopedias and Indexes.**

Allen, Francis. *A Complete English Dictionary*. London: J. Wilson and J. Fell, 1765.

Ash, John. *The New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*. London: Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775.



Bailey, Nathan. *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. London: J.J. and P. Knapton, 1735.

----- *Dictionarium Britannicum: or a more compleat etymological English Dictionary than any extant*. London: T. Cox, 1730.

Barclay, James. *A Complete and Universal English Dictionary*. New Edition Corrected and Improved. London: J. F. and C. Rivington, 1792.

Burke, John. *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire*. The Fourth Edition (Corrected to 1833). London: H. Colburn, 1833.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. Edited by Brandi Besalke. Digital Edition of the 1755 Classic. 2017. <https://johnsonsdictionaryonline.com>

Kelsey, John. *A New English Dictionary: Or, Compleat Collection of the Most Proper and Significant Words, commonly used in the language*. London: Henry Bonwicke, 1702.

Ware, James Redding. *Passing English of the Victorian Era: A Dictionary of Heterodox English, Slang and Phrase*. London: Routledge, 1909.

Wesley, John. *The Complete English Dictionary: Explaining Most of the Those Hard Words, Which are Found in the Best English Writers*. The Third Edition. London: R. Hawes, 1777.

Wilkes, John. *Encyclopaedia Londinensis; or Universal Dictionary of Arts, Sciences and Literature*. Vol. 1. London: J. Adlard, 1810.

### **Government Documents**

England and Wales. Parliament. “Charles II, 1661: An Act for the Establishing Articles and Orders for the regulateing and better Government of His Majesties Navies Ships of Warr & Forces by Sea” in *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*. Edited by John Raithby. s.l: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819: 311-314.

----- “Elizabeth I, 1562: An Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Sodomy” in *The Statutes at Large, of England and of Great Britain: From Magna Carta to the Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland*. Edited by John Raithby. Vol. 4. London: G. Eyre and A Strahan, 1811: 145.

----- “Henry VIII, 1533: An Act for the Punishment of the Vice of Buggery” in *The Statutes at Large, of England and of Great Britain: From Magna Carta to the Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland*. Edited by John Raithby. Vol. 3. London: G. Eyre and A. Strahan, 1811: 231-32.

----- *Laws of War and Ordinances of the Sea. Ordained and Established by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England ... Saturday the 25<sup>th</sup> of December, 1652*. London: John Field, 1652.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. *Calendar of State Papers: Preserved in the Public Record Office*. Domestic Series, of the Reign of William III ... Vol. 9 (1698). London: Printed for H. M. Stationary Office, by Mackie and Co. Ltd., 190837.

Rodger, N.A.M. (ed). *Articles of War: The Statutes Which Governed Our Fighting Navies, 1661, 1749 and 1866*. Havant: Kenneth Mason, 1982.

### **Law and Trial Accounts**

*A Compleat Collection of Remarkable Tryals of the Most Notorious Malefactors, at the Sessions-House in the Old Baily, for near Fifty Years Past*. London: J. Philips, [1718]-21.

*A Faithful Narrative of the Proceedings in a Late Affair between the Rev. Mr. John Swinton and Mr. George Baker, both of Wadham College, Oxford*. London: Printed and sold at the Britannia, MDCCXXXIX [1739].

*A Full and True Account of the Discovery and Apprehending A Notorious Gang of Sodomites in St. James's: With the Examination and Commitment of Two of them to Newgate, by Sir Henry Dutton Colt*. London: T. Bland, 1707.

*A Genuine Account of the Behaviour, Confessions and Dying Words of the Malefactors ... who were Executed at Kennington Common*. London: J. Nicolson, [1743].

*A Report of the Trial of the Reverend Thomas Jephson, for a Misdemeanor, at the Cambridge Summer Assizes, 1823, on Wednesday, July 23, Before Mr. Serjeant Bosanquet, and a Common Jury*. [London]: n.p., 1823.

Addams, Jesse. *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Ecclesiastical Courts at Doctors' Commons: Michaelmas Term, 1825- Trinity Term, 1826*. London: W. M'Dowall, 1825.

*An Account of the Proceedings Against Capt. Edward Rigby, at the Sessions of Goal Delivery, held at Justice-Hall in the Old Bailey, on Wednesday the Seventh Day of December, 1698 for Intending to Commit the Abominable Sin of Sodomy, on the Body of one William Minton*. London: Printed by Order of the Court, 1698.

Benbow, William. "The Crimes of the Clergy, Or The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken. Character and crimes of the Rev. John Fenwick, B.A. And formerly Vicker of Byall, in the County of Northumberland, who absconded for the Crime of Sodomy, in the year 1797, and now resides at Naples" [1823] in in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 379-393.

"The Bishop!! Particulars of the Charge Against the Hon. Percy Jocelyn, Bishop of Clogher for an Abominable Offence with John Movelley, a soldier of the First Regiment of Foot Guards; including the Evidence before the Magistrate at Marlborough Street, and a variety of information and Remarks which has never before appeared in print. By a gentleman connected with the public press" [1822] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 347-369.

Blackstone, William. *Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England in Four Volumes*. Edited with an introduction by Wayne Morrison. London: Cavendish, 2001.

*The Bloody Register. A select and judicious collection of the most remarkable trials, for murder, treason, rape, sodomy, highway robbery, piracy, House-Breaking, Perjury, Forgery, and other high Crimes and Misdemeanors. From the year 1700, to the year 1764 inclusive. ...* Vol.3. London: E. and M. Viney, MDCCLXIV [1764].

Charlton, Joseph. *The Last Dying Words of Joseph Charlton of North-Shields, Watchmaker who was Executed at Morpeth, April 1819, for an Unnatural Offense*. Alnwick,: Pollard, Printer, [1819].

Chedworth, John Howe. *Two Actions, between John Howe, Esq. and George Lewis Dive, Esq: Tried by a Special Jury, ... at the Assizes Holden at Croyden, on Wednesday the 15<sup>th</sup> of August, 1781*. The Second Edition. London: G. Kearsley, 1781.

Clutton, Charles. *Particulars of the Execution of Charles Clutton*. Northampton: Freeman, 1824.

Coke, Edward. *The Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England: Concerning High Treason, and other Pleas of the Crown*. London: E. and R. Brooke, 1797.

Disney, John. *A View of Ancient Laws, against Immorality and Profaneness*. Cambridge: Corn. Cornfield, 1729.

Dowling, Joseph A. "The Sentence and Affidavit of John Church, The Obelisk Preacher for an attempt to commit an unnatural crime on Adam Foreman, at Vauxhall, together with Judge Bayley's impressive address to the prisoner, at full length. At the Court of King's Bench, Nov. 24, 1817" [1817] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 249-255.

*English Reports (Full Reprint), 1378-1865*. 176 Vols. + 2 Index Vols. Edinburgh/London: Wm. Green & Sons/ Stevens & Sons, 1900-132.

*Final Commitment of Allison, for a Destestable Crime*. London: Birt., [1825].

Fortescue-Aland, John. *Reports of select cases in all the Courts of Westminster-Hall*. By ... John Lord Fortescue, ... [London], 1748.

Gladfelder, Hal (Ed). "The Indictment of John Purser, Containing Thomas Cannon's *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplifyd* [1750]" *Eighteenth Century Life* 31 (1) 2007: 39-61.

Gonson, Sir John. *Sir John Gonson's Five Charges to Several Juries*. The Third Edition. London: W. Meadows, 1730.

Hale, Sir Matthew. *Historia Placitorum Coronae: The History of the Pleas of the Crown*. Savoy: E. and R. Nutt, 1736.

*Hertford Calendar: Lent Assizes 1820.* Hertford: Shaw & Co., Printers, [1820].

Jackson, Valentine. *Remarkable Trials at the Lancashire Assizes, Held August 1806, at Lancaster before Sir Robert Graham.* London: J. Day, 1806.

Jackson, William. *The New and Complete Newgate calendar; or, villany displayed in all its branches.* 5 vols. London: Alex. Hogg, [1795].

Lawrence, Gabriel, William Griffen, and Thomas Wright. *The last speech of Mr. Gabriel Lawrence, who was executed at Tyburn, with William Griffen and Thomas Wright, for sodomy, on Monday the 9th of this inst. May, 1726.* Dublin: Printed by G.F. in Castle-street, [1726].

Lawyer, A. *The State of the Case of Captain Jones, as it was on Tuesday Presented to His Majesty; and in Consequence of which he was pleased to grant a Respite till Wednesday next.* London: T. Peat, [1772].

*The Malefactor's Register: or, The Newgate and Tyburn calendar: containing the authentic lives, trials, accounts of executions and dying speeches of the most notorious violators of the laws of their country...from the year 1700 to Lady-day 1779.* [London]: Alexander Hogg, [1779].

Mandeville, Bernard. *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn.* London: J. Roberts, M.DCC.XXV [1725].

Myers, D.T. *The Last Dying Words, Behaviour and Confession of D.T. Myers.* Leicester: Pares, 1812.

Oldham, James (ed). *The Mansfield Manuscripts and the Growth of English Law in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century.* 2 vols. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1992.

Powis, Joseph. *A Compleat and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of Joseph Powis.* London: J. Applebee, A. Dod, and E. Nut, 1732.

Robertson, David. *The Trial of David Robertson... for an Unnatural Crime with George Foulston: tried before Sir Robert Graham... on Saturday May 24 1806, at Justice-Hall in the Old Bailey.* London: J. Day, 1806.

*Select Trials at the Sessions-House in the Old-Bailey, for murder, robberies, rapes, sodomy, coining, ... To which are added, genuine accounts of the lives, behaviour, confessions, and dying speeches of the most eminent convicts. ... From the year 1720, to this time. ...* 5 vols. Dublin: S.Powell, 1742-43.

Sheppard, William Dillon. *Some particulars relating to the life of William Dillon Sheppard, Who was executed at St. Michael's Hill Gallows, for sodomy, on Monday the 1st of June, 1761. Published at his own request, and by the authority of the sheriff.* Bristol: E. Ward, 1761.

Stubbs, W. and G. Talmash. *The Crown Circuit Companion: Containing the Practice of the Assizes on the Crown Side, and of the Courts of General and General Quarter Sessions of the Peace*. 2 vols. Savoy: H. Lintot, 1749.

“The Trial and Conviction of John Church, the Preacher of the Surrey Tabernacle, Borough Road at the Surrey Assizes, at Croydon, on Saturday the 16<sup>th</sup> of August, 1817, for an assault with intent to commit an unnatural crime. Taken in short-hand, by a barrister. The profits arising from this Publication will be given to the Prosecutor to assist in defraying the expenses of the Prosecution” [1817] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 281-346.

“The Trial and Conviction of Several Reputed Sodomites” [1707] in *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century writing*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 1997: 64-66.

*The Trial and Conviction of that Infamous Hypocrite John Church... For an Abominable Offence... Tried before Lord Ellenborough, at the Surrey Assizes, Croyden, Saturday, August 16, 1817*. Fifth Edition. London: John Fairburn, 1817.

Trumbach, Randolph (ed). “The Trial of Richard Branson, for an Attempt to commit Sodomy, on the Body of James Fassett” [1760] in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents*. Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England, 1660-1800, Vol 24. Edited by Randolph Trumbach. New York: Garland Publishing, 1986.

----- “The Trial of Samuel Scrimshaw and John Ross, for A Conspiracy, in Sending Threatening Letters to Humphry Morice, Esq.” [1759] in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents*. Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England, 1660-1800, Vol 24. Edited by Randolph Trumbach. New York: Garland Publishing, 1986.

----- “The Whole Proceedings On the Wicked Conspiracy Carried on against the Hon. Edward Walpole, Esq; by John Cather, Adam Nixon, Daniel Alexander, Patrick Cane alias Kane, and others” [1751] in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents*. Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England, 1660-1800, Vol 24. Edited by Randolph Trumbach. New York: Garland Publishing, 1986.

*The Tryal and Conviction of Several Reputed Sodomites, before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, and Recorder of London, at Guild-Hall, the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of October, 1707*. London: J. Morphew, 1707.

*The Tryal of Mr. John Lowther, for Assault on John Bushnell, with an Intent to Commit the Crime of Sodomy: At an Adjournment of the General Sessions of the Peace, at Guild-Hall, the 7<sup>th</sup> of October, 1761*. London: J. Scott, M,DCCLXI [1761].

*The Tyburn Chronicle: or, Villainy Display'd in All its Branches. Containing an authentic account of the lives, adventures, tryals, executions, and last dying speeches of the most notorious male factors. From the year 1700, to the present time*. Vol. 1. London: J. Cooke, [1768].

## Novels, Satire & Poetry

Arnall, William. *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Codex*. The Second Edition. London: T. Cooper, 1733.

Baker, Thomas. *Tunbridge-Walks: Or, The Yeoman of Kent. A Comedy*. The Sixth Edition. London: Bernard Lintot, 1727.

Beckford, William. *Vathek and the Episodes of Vathek*. Edited by Kenneth W. Graham. Translated by Sir Frank T. Marzials and Kenneth Graham. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2001.

Blake, William. *Visions of the Daughters of Albion*. Edited by Robert N. Essick. San Marino, CA: Huntingdon Library, 2002.

Byron, George Gordon. *Byron's Don Juan*. Edited by A. Cunningham. Philadelphia: J. B. Smith, 1859.

----- *Byron's Poetical Works*. Edited by Ernest Hartley Coleridge. Produced by Jonathan Ingram. Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition. 3 vols. 2015.

----- *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*. Edited by Les Bowler and David Widger. Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition. Project Gutenberg, 2004.

----- *The Complete Poetical Works*. Edited by Jerome J. McGann. 7 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

----- *Fugitive Pieces*. Edited by David Starner and William Flis. Project Gutenberg Ebook Edition of the 1806 Original. Project Gutenberg, March 2005.

Carey, Henry. *Faustina: Or, the Roman Songstress, a Satyr, on the Luxury and Effeminacy of the Age*. London: J. Roberts, 1726.

Churchill, Charles. *Poems*. 2 vols. [London]: Printed in the year 1768, [1768].

Cleland, John. *The Memoirs of Fanny Hill*. A New and Genuine Edition from the Original Text (London, 1749). Paris: Isidore Liseux, 1888.

Defoe, Daniel. *The Poor Man's Plea to all the Proclamations, Declarations, Acts of Parliament, &c., which have been, or shall be made, or published, for a Reformation of Manners, and suppressing immorality in the Nation*. The Second Edition, Corrected. London: A. Baldwin, 1698.

----- *Reformation of Manners: A Satyr*. [London]: Printed in the Year MDCCII, 1702.

Dunton, John. "The He-Strumpets: A Satyr on the Sodomite Club" in *Athenianism*. London: Tho. Darrack, 1710: 93-99.

Fielding, Henry. *The History of Tom Jones: A Foundling*. London: A. Millar, 1749.

----- *Miscellanies*. 3 vols. London: A. Millar, 1743.

“The Fruit Shop” [1766] in *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century writing*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 1997: 172-174.

Gentleman of Fortune. *The Complete Modern London Spy, for the present year, 1781*. Revised, corrected and improved by Richard King. London: Alex. Hogg, 1781.

Gilbert, Thomas. *A View of the Town: In an Epistle to a Friend in the Country. A Satire*. London: R. Penny, 1735.

Goodall, William. *The Adventures of Capt. Greenland*. 4 vols. London: R. Baldwin, 1752.

Gordon, Thomas. *The Humourist: Being Essays upon Several Subjects*. 2 vols. London: T. Woodward, 1725.

Gray, Thomas. *An Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College*. London: R. Dodsley, 1747.

Gray, Thomas, William Collins, and Oliver Goldsmith. *Poems of Thomas Gray, William Collins, Oliver Goldsmith*. Longman’s Annotated English Poets. Harlow: Longmans, 1969.

Hervey, John. “To Mr. Fox, written at Florence. In Imitation of Horace, Ode IV, Book 2”, in *A Collection of Poems, by Several Hands*. Edited by Robert Dodsley. Vol. 3. London: R. Dodsley, 1748: 240-242.

Hesiod. *Theogony & Works and Days*. Translated by Stephanie Nelson and Richard Caldwell. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2015.

Homer. *The Iliad of Homer [1715]*. Translated by Alexander Pope. Edited by Rev. Theodore Buckley. Project Gutenberg Edition from 1899 Buckley Edition. Project Gutenberg, Sept. 2006.

Jackson, William. *Sodom and Onan: a Satire, inscribed to Samuel Foote, Esq., alias the Devil upon two sticks*. London: Printed for the Author, [1772].

Kendrick, William. *Love in the Suds, a Town Ecologue. Being the Lamentation of Roscius for the Loss of his Nyky*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. London: J. Wheeble, M.DCC.LXXII [1772].

*Love Letters between a Certain Late Nobleman and the Famous Beau Wilson*. London: A. Moore, 1729.

“Mundus Foppensis: or, The Fop Display’d [1691]” in *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century writing*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 1997: 124-125.

Pope, Alexander. *The Works of Alexander Pope*. 6 Vols. London: A. Millar, J. and R. Tonson, H. Lintot and C. Bathurst, 1764.

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela: Or, Virtue Rewarded*. Edited by Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *The Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley in Verse and Prose, Now First Brought Together with Many Pieces Not Before Published*. London: Reeves and Turner, 1880.

Smollett, Tobias. *The Adventures of Roderick Random*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. 2 Vols. London: Printed for J. Osborn, 1748.

*The Tricks of the Town Laid Open; or, A Companion for Country Gentlemen; To Which is Added, an Appendix: Containing, Three Letters, Giving Some Curious Anecdotes Relating to Captain J---s, B-----St-ff, and D—b-----r; with an Entire New Description of a Catamite's First Salutation to a Stranger*. The Seventh Edition. London: G. Allen and A. Lindsay, 1772.

"The Wadhamites: A Burlesque Poem" [1739] in *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century writing*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 1997: 100-104.

Ward, Edward. *The History of the London Clubs, or the Citizen's Pastime. Particularly the Lying Club...The Broken Shopkeeper's Club, the Basket Woman's Club. With a Sermon Preached to a gang of highwaymen. Part 1 by the author of the London Spy*. London: Printed for J. Bagnall, 1709.

-----*The London Spy*. Edited by Paul Hyland. From the Fourth Edition of 1709. East Lansing, MI: Colleagues Press, 1993.

-----*The modern world disrob'd: or, both sexes stript of their pretended vertue. In two parts. First, Of the Ladies. Secondly, Of the Gentlemen. With Familiar Descant upon every Character*. London: printed for G. S. and sold by B. Bragge, 1708.

----- *Satirical Reflections on Clubs. By the Author of the London Spy*. London: A. Bettesworth, M.DCC.XIX [1719].

-----*The Second Part of the History of the London Clubs. Containing the No-Nose Club, the Beaus Club, The Farting Club, The Sodomites or Mollies Club, The Quack's Club*. London: J. Dutton, [1709?].

"The Woman-Hater's Lamentation: or A New Copy of Verses on the Fatal End of Mr. Grant, a Woollen-Draper, and two others that Cut their Throats or Hang'd themselves in the Counter; with the discovery of near Hundred more that are Accused for unnatural dispising the *Fair Sex*, and Intriguing with one another" [1707] in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents. Marriage, Sex, and the Family in England, 1660-1800, Vol 24*. Edited by Randolph Trumbach. New York: Garland Publishing, 1986.



## Pamphlets & Broadsides

Arbuthnot, John. *It Cannot Rain But it Pours: Or, London Strow'd with Rarities*. London: J. Roberts, 1726.

Bradbury, Charles. "Mr. Bradbury's Case Truly Stated" [1755] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 27-89.

----- "The Cobbler Undone, By the Loss of His Awl and His Ends" [1756] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 125-163.

Broderick, Isaac. *An Appeal to the Public; or, the Case of Mr. Isaac Broderick, late of Trinity College, Cambridge, fairly and impartially stated*. [London]: Printed for the Author, 1731.

Cobbett, William. *The Parson and the Boy: or, the Fire-Shovel Hats in a Bustle*. London: Printed and Published by and for J. M. Cobbett, No 185, Fleet-street, 1823.

"A Correct Account of the Horrible Occurrence which Took Place at a Public-House in St James's Market in which it was discovered that The Right Honorable Rev. Father in God The Bishop of Clogher, Lately transferred from the Bishop of Ferns, was a principal actor with A Common Soldier! To the disgrace not only of the Cloth, to which he was attached, and as a Commissioner of the Board of Education, and a Dictator of Public Morals, but as a Member of that Nation which gave him Birth" [1822] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 371-378.

D'Anvers, Caleb. *A Proper Reply to a Late Scurrilous Libel Intituled Sedition and Defamation Display'd*. London: Printed for R. Francklin in Russel-Street, 1731.

Dalton, James. *A Genuine Narrative of all the Street Robberies committed since October last, by James Dalton ...* Taken from the mouth of James Dalton. London: Printed and sold by James Roberts, at the Oxford Arms in Warwick Lane, 1728.

Fowler, Edward. *A Vindication of a Late Undertaking of Certain Gentlemen, in Order to the Suppressing of Debauchery and Profaneness*. London, 1692.

Guthrie, William. *A Reply to the Counter-Address; being a vindication of a pamphlet entitled, An Address to the Public, on the Late Dismission of a General Officer*. London: Printed for W. Nicoll, 1764.

Holloway, Robert. "The Phoenix of Sodom, Or, The Vere Street Coterie" [1813] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 185-213.

"The Infamous Life of John Church, the St. George's Fields Preacher. From his infancy up to his trial and conviction, with his confession, sent in a Letter to the Rev. Mr. L----,

two days after his Attack on Adam Foreman, at Vauxhall, with Clerical Remarks by the same Gentlemen; to which is added, his Love Epistles to E\*\*\*\*B\*\*\*\*. Together with various other Letters, particularly to one Cook, of Vere-Street Notoriety” [1817] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 257-279.

Latham, Thomas. *The Rod in Pickle; or, An Answer to the Appeal of John Church... containing an Authentic Narrative of the Cause of his Leaving Banbury... to wish are Added His Letters Written to the Managers of the Banbury Meeting-House etc*. London: Hay & Turner, 1817.

Mandeville, Bernard. *A Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Public Benefits*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. 2 Vols. London: Printed for Edmund Parker, 1723.

----- *A Modest Defence of Publick Stews: or, An Essay Upon Whoring*. London: T. Read, 1740.

Neaves, Thomas. *The Life of Thomas Neaves, the Noted Street-Robber, Executed at Tyburn, on Friday the Seventh of February, 1728-9, for Shop-lifting. ... His Private Villanies, Publick Vices and Intrigues, with some Sodomitical Professors*. London: Printed for and Sold by R. Walker, [1729].

Norton, Rictor (ed). “The Women’s Complaint to Venus, 1698” in *Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England: A Sourcebook*. Updated 30 April 2013. <<http://www.rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/complain.htm>>.

Taylor, John. “Remarks on Mr. Bradbury’s State of His Case” [1755] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy*. Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 91-124.

Trumbach, Randolph (ed). “The Woman-Hater’s Lamentation: Or A New Copy of Verses on the Fatal End of Mr. Grant, a Wollen-Draper, and Two Others That Cut Their Throats or Hang’d Themselves in the Counter; with the Discovery of near Hundred More That Are Accused for Unnatural Dispising of the Fair Sex, and Intriguing with One Another [1707]” in *Sodomy Trials: Seven Documents*. Vol. 24: Marriage, Sex and the Family in England, 1660-1800. New York: Garland Pub., 1986.

Wild, Jonathan. *An Answer to a Late Insolent Libel ... with a Diverting Scene of a Sodomitish Academy*. London: Printed for Tho. Warner, at the Black Boy in Paternoster Row, 1718.

Welch, Saunders. *A Proposal to Render Effectual a Plan to Remove the Nuisance of Common Prostitutes from the Streets of this Metropolis*. London: Printed for C. Henderson, 1758.

Woodward, Josiah. *An Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners, in England and Ireland*. The Fifth Edition. London: Printed by J. Downing, 1701.

----- *An Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners, in London and Westminster, and other Parts of the Kingdom.* London: Printed for B. Aylmer, 1699.

### **Philosophy, History, Natural Philosophy and Medicine**

Bentham, Edward. *An Introduction to Moral Philosophy.* The Second Edition. Oxford: Printed at the Theater for James Fletcher, 1746.

Bentham, Jeremy. "Jeremy Bentham's 'Essay on Paederasty'[1785]." Edited by Louis Crompton. Part I: *Journal of Homosexuality* 3 (4), 1978: 383-388. Part II: *Journal of Homosexuality* 4 (1), 1978: 91-107.

----- *Of Sexual Irregularities, and Other Writings on Sexual Morality. The Collected Works of Jeremy Bentham: Penology and Criminal Law, Religion and the Church.* Edited by Philip Schofield, Catherine Pease-Watkin and Michael Quinn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2014.

Bethum, John. *A Short View of the Human Faculties and Passions.* Second Edition. Edinburgh: Printed for A. Neill, 1770.

Burgh, James. *The Art of Speaking: Containing an Essay, in which are given rules for expressing the principal passions and humours, which occur in Reading, or public speaking.* London: Printed for T. Longman, J. Buckland, and W. Fenner, in Pater-Noster Row, 1761.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful.* The Fifth Edition. London: J. Dodsley, 1767.

Cheyne, George. *An Essay of Health and Long Life.* Bath: G. Strahan and J. Leake, 1724.

Cogan, Thomas. *Philosophical Treatise on the Passions.* 1<sup>st</sup> American Edition. Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1821.

Cooper, Sir Ashley Anthony. Earl of Shaftesbury. *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Times.* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by John Robertson. Volume 2. London: Grant Richards, 1900.

Crouch, Nathaniel. *Unparallel'd Varieties: Or, the Matchless Actions and Passions of Mankind.* By Robert Burton. The Fourth Edition. London. Printed for A. Bettesworth, 1728.

Drake, James. *Anthropolgia Nova, or A New System of Anatomy.* London: Printed for Sam. Smith and Benj. Walford, 1707.

Ferguson, Adam. *Institutes of Moral Philosophy.* Third Edition, Enlarged. Edinburgh: Printed for John Bell & William Creech, 1785.

Fielding, John. *The Universal Mentor: Containing, Essays on the Most Important Subjects in Life.* London: Printed for A. Millar, 1763.

Foote, Samuel. *A Treatise on the Passions so far as they regard the Stage, with a critical enquiry into the theatrical merit of Mr. G-----k, Mr. Q---n, and Mr. B----y*. London: Printed for C. Corbet, 1747.

Forbes, Alexander. *Moral and Philosophical Essays on Several Subjects, Viz. A View of the Human Faculties*. London: Printed for T. Longman in Pater-noster Row, M.DCC.LXII [1762].

Gibbon, Edward. *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Edited by David Widger. 1996 Project Gutenberg Edition. 6 Vols. 2008.

Graham, Catherine Macauley. *Letters on Education*. London: Printed for C. Dilly, 1790.

Hartley, David. *Observations on Man: His Frame, His Duty and His Expectations*. London: First printed in MDCCXLIX. Reprinted by J. Johnson, 1791.

Hervey, John Hervey. *Some Materials Toward Memoirs of the Reign of King George II*. Edited by Romney Sedgwick. Reprint of the 1931 Edition. 3 Vols. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan: Or, the Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill*. London: Andrew Croke, 1651.

Hogarth, William. *The Analysis of Beauty*. London: Printed by T. Reeves, 1753.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Edited by L.A. Selby-Bigge. Reprinted from the Original Edition [1739]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.

Hutcheson, Francis. *An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions and Affections*. Dublin: Reprinted by S. Powell, 1728.

----- *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*. 2 Vols. London: Printed by John Darby, 1725.

Kames, Henry Home. *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion*. Corrected and Improved, in a Third Edition. Edinburgh: Printed for John Bell, 1779.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Nature*. Originally published in 1689. Edited by Alexander Campbell Fraser. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.

*The Mirror of Human Nature. Wherein are Exhibited Analytical Definitions of the Natural and Moral Faculties, Affections, and Passions ... to which is subjoined, a Systematical View of Human Knowledge*. London: Printed for J. Bew, Pater-Noster Row, 1775.

*Onania: or the Heinous Sin of Self-Pollution and all its frightful consequences (in both sexes)*. The Eighteenth Edition. London: H. Cooke, 1756.

Payne, George. *Elements of Mental and Moral Science: Designed to Exhibit the Original Susceptibilities of the Mind, and the Rule by which the Rectitude of Any of its States or Feelings Should be Judged*. London: B.J. Holdsworth, 1828.

Plato. *The Banquet: A Dialogue of Plato Concerning Love*. Translated by Floyer Sydenham. 2 Vols. London: Printed by H. Woodfall, 1761-1767.

Radicati, Alberto. *A Phliosophical [sic] Dissertation upon Death: Composed for the Consolation of the Unhappy*. Translated by John Morgan. London: Printed and Sold by W. Mears, 1732.

Ray, John. *Miscellaneous Discourses Concerning the Dissolution and Changes of the World*. London: Samuel Smith, 1692.

----- *Three Physico-Theological Discourses, Concerning the Primitive Chaos, and Creation of the World*. The Third Edition Illustrated and Enlarged from the Author's own MSS. London: Printed for William Innys, 1713.

Reid, Thomas. *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*. Edinburgh: J. Bell, 1785.

S., T. *A Dissertation Concerning the Evil Nature and Fatal Consequence of Immoderate Anger and Revenge*. London: Printed for J. Stagg, 1725.

Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper. *An Inquiry Concerning Virtue*. London: Printed for A. Bell, 1699.

----- *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. Edited by John M. Robertson. 2 Vols. London: Grant Richards, 1900 [1711].

Smith, Adam. *The Theory Of Moral Sentiments; ... to which is added, A Dissertation on the Origin of Languages*. Edited by Dugald Stewart. New Edition. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854 [1759].

Symonds, John Addington. "A Problem in Modern Ethics [1891]" in *Male Love: A Problem in Greek Ethics and Other Writings*. Edited by John Lauritson. New York: Pagan Press, 1973.

Watts, Isaac. *The Doctrine of the Passions Explained and Improved*. Dublin: Printed by R. Reilly, on Cork Hill, for G. Ewing, Bookseller at the Angel and Bible in Dame Street, 1737.

Weldon, Anthony. *The Court and Character of King James, written and taken by Sir A.W.* Reprint. London: Printed for R.J. and to be sold by J. Wright, 1817.

### **Sermons & Religious Treatises**

*A Treatise, wherein are strict observations on that detestable and most shocking sin of sodomy, blasphemy and atheism*. London: Printed for A. Moore, near St. Paul's, 1728.

Abbot, Henry. *Unity, Friendship and Charity Recommended in a Sermon Preached before the Gloucestershire Society, Aug. 27 1713*. Bristol: Printed by Sam Farley, 1713.

Allen, John. *The Destruction of Sodom improved, as a Warning to Great-Britain. A Sermon Preached on the Fast-Day, Friday, February 6, 1756. At Hanover-Street, Long-Acre. By the Rev. Dr. Allen, Morning Preacher there. Published at the Request of the Congregation*. London: printed for A. Millar, at Buchanan's Head in the Strand; and J. & S. Johnson, at the Golden Anchor in Fenchurch Street, MDCCLVI. [1756].

*An Earnest Appeal to Passionate People; ... To Which is Added, An Essay on Envy, Malice and Detraction*. London: Printed for W. Owen, at Homer's Head, near Temple Bar, 1748.

Astell, Mary, and Norris, John. *Letters Concerning the Love of God*. The Third Edition. London: Printed for Edmund Parker, at the Bible and Crown, 1730.

*The Beauty of Love and Friendship. Intermixed with a great Variety of Suprising and Diverting Examples*. The Third Edition, Corrected. London: Printed for Jacob Robinson, 1745.

Bedford, Arthur. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners at St. Mary-le-Bow, ... 1733*. London: Printed for Jos. Downing, in Bartholomew Close, near West Smithfield, 1734.

Bidlake, John. *Sermons, on Various Subjects*. 2 Vols. London: Printed for T. Chapman, 1795.

Bockett, John. *Pride Exposed and Opposed... in divers scriptural instances and examples*. London: Printed and sold by J. Sowle, in White-Hart-Court in Gracious-Street, 1710.

Bragge, Francis. *A Practical Treatise of the Regulation of the Passions*. London: Printed by J.M. for John Wyat, 1708.

Bray, Thomas. *For God, or for Satan: Being a Sermon preach'd at St. Mary le Bow, before the Societies for Reformation of Manners ... Dec. 27 1708*. London: Printed and Sold by H. Hills, in Black-fryars, near the Water-side, 1809.

Burroughs, Joseph. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... June, 1731*. London: Printed for E. Matthews, at the Bible in Pater-Noster Row, 1731.

Burrow, Robert. *Civil Society and Government Vindicated from the Charge of being Founded on, and Preserved by, Dishonest Arts*. London: Printed for John and Barham Clark, at the Bible and Crown, at the Poultry, near Cheapside, 1723.

Butler, Joseph. *Fifteen Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel*. London: Printed by W. Botham, for J. and J. Knapton, 1726.

Carr, Robert. *An Antidote against Lust: or, a Discourse of Uncleaness*. London: Printed by J. Ashwood for John Dunton, at the Raven in the Poultry, 1690.

Chandler, Rev. Edward. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January 1724*. London: Printed for James Knapton, at the Crown in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1724.

Clark, Samuel. *The Government of Passion. A Sermon Preach'd before the Queen at St. James's Chapel, on Sunday the 7<sup>th</sup> of January 1710/11*. London: Printed by Will. Botham, for James Knapton, at the Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1711.

Collet, Samuel. *The Christian's Rule of Love, ... In a Discourse on the Duty of Love*. London: Printed for J. Noon, 1742.

*The Conduct of the Stage Consider'd. Being a Short Historical Account ... Together with the Argument's Urg'd Against it... With Short Remarks upon the Original and Pernicious Consequences of Masquerades*. London: Eman. Matthews, 1721.

Davy, William. *A System of Divinity, in a Course of Sermons, on the first Institutions of Religion*. 26 vols. Lustleigh, Devon: Printed by Himself, 1797.

Drew, Robert. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January 1734*. London: Printed for M. Downing, in Bartholomew Close, West Smithfield, 1735.

Erskine, Ralph. *Preventing Love: or, God's Love to Us, the Cause of Our Love to Him. Being a Sermon Preached ... at Portmoak, June 3 1723*. Belfast: Printed for Robert Johnston, 1764.

Fawcett, John. *An Essay on Anger*. Leeds: Printed by Thomas Wright, for the Author, 1787.

*The Friend: or, Essays Instructive and Entertaining for Youth of Both Sexes*. London: Printed for R. Snagg, No. 29, Pater-Noster Row, 1774.

Fordyce, James. *Addresses to Young Men*. 2 Vols. Dublin: John Exshaw, 1777.

George, William. *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster, on Monday May 29, 1732*. London: Printed for J. Tonson, 1732.

Gibson, Edmund. *A Sermon Preached for the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 6<sup>th</sup> 1723*. London: Printed for John Wyat at the Rose in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1723.

Gilbert, John. *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords, in the Abbey-Church of Westminster, on Saturday, Jan. 30, 1741-2*. London: Printed for J. Stagg, 1742.

Green, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 16<sup>th</sup> 1726*. London: Printed and sold by Joseph Downing, in Bartholomew Close, near West Smithfield, M.DCC.XXVII [1727].

Guyse, John. *Youth's Monitor, in Six Annual Sermons preach'd to young people at New Broad-street*. London: Printed for J. Oswald, 1736.

Hales, John. *A Discourse of the Several Dignities and Corruptions of Man's Nature*. London: Printed for E. Curll, next the Temple Coffee House in Fleet Street, M.DCC.XX [1720]

Hare, Francis. *A Sermon Preached before the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 5<sup>th</sup> 1730*. London: Printed for Jos. Downing, in Bartholomew Close near West Smithfield, 1731.

*Hell upon earth: or the town in an uproar. Occasion'd by the late horrible scenes of forgery, perjury, street-robbery, murder, sodomy, and other shocking impieties*. London: printed for J. Roberts in Warwick-Lane, and A. Dodd without Temple-Bar, 1729.

Heylyn, John. *A Sermon Preached before the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 8<sup>th</sup> 1728*. London: Printed and sold by Joseph Downing, in Bartholomew Close near West Smithfield, M.DCC.XXIX [1729].

Hickes, George. *Sermons on Several Subjects*. London: Printed for A.C. and sold by W. Taylor, 1715.

Humphreys, Thomas. *Marriage an Honourable Estate. A Sermon Preached at Driffild in Gloucestershire*. London: Printed for James Crockatt, 1742.

Hunt, Jeremiah. *Mutual Love Recommended upon Christian Principles*. London: Printed for T. Cox, 1728.

Jenks, Silvester. *Essay upon the Art of Love*. London: s.n., 1702.

Jones, Erasmus. *Luxury, Pride and Vanity, the Bane of the British Nation*. The Fourth Edition, with additions. London: Printed for J. Roberts, 1736.

Knight, James. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 15<sup>th</sup> 1732*. London: Printed for Jos. Downing, in Bartholomew Close, near West Smithfield, 1733.

Lamont, David. *Sermons on the Most Prevalent Vices*. London: Stanley Crowder, 1780.

Law, William. *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. London: Printed for William Innys, 1729.

M., A. *Moral Essays, chiefly collected from different authors*. 2 Vols. Liverpool: Printed by J. M'Creery, 1796.



----- *Remarks on Revelation & Infidelity: Being the Substance of Several Speeches lately delivered to a Private Literary Society in Edinburgh.* Edinburgh: Printed by John Moir, 1797.

Masham, Damaris. *A Discourse Concerning the Love of God.* London: Awnsham and John Churchil, 1696.

Minister of the Church of England. *The Sodomites Shame and Doom, Laid Before Them with Great Grief and Compassion.* London: Printed for J. Downing, 1702.

*A Modest Defence of Chastity.* London: Printed for, and sold by, A. Buttersworth, at the Red-Lyon, in Pater-noster Row, 1726.

Norris, John. *The Theory and Regulation of Love.* Oxford: Printed at the Theatre for Hen. Clements, 1688.

*Onania: or, the Heinous Sin of Self-Pollution and its Frightful Consequences, in both Sexes.* Eighteenth Edition. London: Printed for H. Cooke at the Correct Star, Fleet Street, 1756.

“Reasons for the Growth of Sodomy” [1749] in *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century writing.* Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 1997: 135-143.

“Religion & Morality Vindicated, Against Hypocrisy and Pollution; or An Account of the Life and Character of John Church the Obelisk Preacher, who was formerly a frequenter of Vere-street, and who has been charged with Unnatural Practices in various places. To which is annexed, A Facsimile of a Letter, written by him to James Cook, who kept the infamous house in Vere-street” [1813] in *Sexual Outcasts, 1750-1850. Volume 2: Sodomy.* Edited by Ian McCormick. London: Routledge, 2000: 215- 248.

*Satan's harvest home: or the Present State of Whorecraft, Adultery, Fornication, Procuring, Pimping, Sodomy, And the Game at Flatts.* London: printed for the editor, 1749.

*The Shameful Sin, with the exceeding sinfulness, and evil effects of it.* London: Printed for T. Astley, 1743.

Smallbroke, Richard. *A Sermon Preached for the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 10<sup>th</sup>, 1727.* London: Printed and sold by Joseph Downing, M.DCC.XXVIII [1728].

Smith, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached for the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... March 5<sup>th</sup>, 1738.* London: Printed for M. Downing, in Bartholomew Close, near West Smithfield, 1738.

South, Robert. *Twelve Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions.* The Sixth Edition. 6 Vols. London: J. Bettenham, 1727.

Strype, John. *The Thankful Samaritan. A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of S. Paul, before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor... September the 16<sup>th</sup> 1711*. London: Printed for J. Wyat, 1711.

Tindal, Matthew. *Christianity as Old as the Creation: Or, The Gospel, a Republication of the Religion of Nature*. London: [n.p.], 1730.

*A Treatise, wherein are strict observations upon that detestable and most shocking sin of sodomy, blasphemy, and atheism*. London: Printed for A. Moore, near St. Paul's, 1728.

Wesley, John. *Serious Thoughts Occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon. To Which is Subjoined An Account of all the late Earthquakes there, and in other Places*. The Sixth Edition. London: Printed in the Year MDCCLVI, [1756].

----- *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*. Third Edition. Vol. 7. London: Published by John Mason, 1830.

Woodward, Josiah. *Sodom's Vices Destructive to Other Cities and States. A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of the City of London, at the Chappel of Guildhall, on Sunday August 1, 1697*. London: Printed by J. D., 1697.

Wynne, John. *A Sermon Preached to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners ... January the 3<sup>rd</sup> 1725*. London: Printed and Sold by Joseph Downing, in Bartholomew Close, near West Smithfield, M.DCC.XXVI [1726].

Young, Edward. *Love of Fame, the Universal Passion*. London: Printed in the year MDCCLIII, [1753].

### **Travel Literature**

Archenholz, Johann Wilhelm von. *A Picture of England: Containing a Description of the Laws, Customs, and Manners of England*. Dublin: P. Byne, 1791.

Blakeney, Lt. Richard. *The Journal of an Oriental Journey in His Majesty's Ship Africaine*. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1841.

Johnson, Samuel. *A Diary of a Journey into North Wales, in the Year 1774*. London: R. Jennings, 1816.

Lithgow, William. *The Totall Discourse of the Rare Adventures & Painefull peregrinations of long nineteen yeares travayles from Scotland to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia and Affrica*. Originally published in 1632. Glasgow: J. MacLehose, 1906.

### **Secondary Sources**

#### **Dissertations and Theses**

Craig, Andrew Gordon. "The Movement for the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1715." PhD. Dissertation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 1980.

Kay, Ailsa. "Trade in Feelings: Shame in Eighteenth-Century Britain." PhD. Dissertation. Hamilton: McMaster University, 2012.

McGraw, Kenneth W. "Dangerous Discourse: Language and Sex Between Men in Eighteenth-Century London." PhD. Dissertation. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 2009.

Mortimer, Brenda Gean. "Rethinking Penal Reform and the Royal Prerogative of Mercy During Robert Peel's Stewardship of the Home Office, 1822-7, 1828-30." PhD. Dissertation. Leicester: University of Leicester, 2017.

Simpson, Antony E. "Masculinity and Control: The Prosecution of Sex Offences in Eighteenth-Century London." PhD. Dissertation. New York: New York University, 1984.

Smeall, Cheryl Lynn. "How to Become a Renowned Writer: Francesco Algarotti (1712-1764) and the Uses of Networking in Eighteenth-Century Europe." PhD. Dissertation. Montreal: McGill University, 2010.

White, Matthew Trevor. "Ordering the Mob: London's Public Punishments, c. 1783-1868." PhD. Dissertation. Hatfield, UK: University of Hertfordshire, 2009.

### **Books and Chapters in Edited Volumes.**

Adams, William Howard. *On Luxury: A Cautionary Tale*. Lincoln, NE: Potomac Books, 2012.

Abelove, Henry. *The Evangelist of Desire: John Wesley and the Methodists*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Adair, Richard. *Courtship, Illegitimacy, and Marriage in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Alexander, Boyd. *England's Wealthiest Son: A Study of William Beckford*. London: Centaur Press, 1962.

Allen, Robert J. *The Clubs of Augustan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933.

Altman, Dennis (ed). *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?: International Conference on Gay and Lesbian Studies*. Amsterdam; London: Uitgeverij An Dekker/ Schorer; GMP, 1989.

Anolik, Ruth Bienstock (ed). *Horriifying Sex: Essays on Sexual Difference in Gothic Literature*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2007.

- Ardal, Pall S. *Passion and Value in Hume's Treatise*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Ashe, Geoffrey. *The Hell-Fire Clubs: A History of Anti-Morality*. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 2000.
- Baier, Annette. *A Progress of Sentiments: Reflections on Hume's Treatise*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Barker-Benfield, G.J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Batten, Guinn. *The Orphaned Imagination: Melancholy and Commodity Culture in English Romanticism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Beattie, J.M. "Crime and Inequality in Eighteenth-Century London", in *Crime and Inequality*. Edited by John Hagen and Ruth Peterson. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995: 116-139.
- *Crime and the Courts in England, 1660-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Bell, Ian A. *Literature and Crime in Augustan England*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Bell, Matthew. *Melancholia: the Western Malady*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Ben-Atar, Doron S. and Richard D. Brown. *Taming Lust: Crimes against Nature in the Early Republic*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- Bennett, Paula and Vernon A. Rosario. *Solitary Pleasures: The Historical, Literary, and Artistic Discourses of Autoeroticism*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Berg, Maxine. *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- and Elizabeth Eger (eds). *Luxury in the Eighteenth-Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Bermingham, Ann and John Brewer (eds). *The Consumption of Culture, 1600-1800: Image, Object, Text*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Berry, Christopher J. *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Berry, Helen. *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late Stuart England: The Cultural World of the Athenian Mercury*. Women and Gender in the Early Modern World. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2003.

----- “Lawful kisses? Sexual Ambiguity and platonic friendship in England, c. 1660-1720”, in *The Kiss in History*. Edited by Karen Harvey. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005: 62-79.

Blackburn, Simon. *Lust: The Seven Deadly Sins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Blaikie, Andrew. *Illegitimacy, Sex, and Society: Northeast Scotland, 1750-1900*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Bleys, Rudi C. *The Geography of Perversion: Male-to-Male Sexual Behaviour Outside the West and the Ethnographic Imagination, 1750-1918*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Bodei, Remo. *Geometry of the Passions: Fear, Hope, Happiness. Philosophy and Political Use*. Translated by Gianpero W. Doebler. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2018.

Boon, Leo. “Those Damned Sodomites: Public Images of Sodomy in the Eighteenth-Century Netherlands” in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Haworth Press, 1989: 237-48.

Boros, Gabor, Herman de Dijn and Martin Moors. *The Concept of Love in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2007.

Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

----- *Same-Sex Unions in Pre-Modern Europe*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Boulukos, George. *The Grateful Slave: The Emergence of Race in Eighteenth-Century British and American Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Bourke, Joanna. *Fear: A Cultural History*. Emeryville, CA: Avalon Pub., 2006.

Braddick, M.J. and Joanna Innes (eds). *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850: Narratives and Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Braund, Susanna Morton and Glenn W. Most (eds). *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*. Yale Classical Studies v. 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Bray, Alan. "A Traditional Rite for Blessing Friendship" in *Love, Sex, Intimacy and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. Edited by Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007: 87-98.

----- *The Friend*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

----- *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*. London: Gay Men's Press, 1982.

Bray, Alan and Michael Rey. "The Body of the Friend: Continuity and Change in Masculine Friendship in the Seventeenth Century" in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. Edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999: 65-84.

Brewer, John and Roy Porter (eds). *Consumption and the World of Goods*. London: Psychology Press, 1994.

Brewer, John. "English Radicalism in the Age of George III" in *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776*. Edited by J.G.A. Pocock. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980: 323-367.

Brewer, William D. "Male Rivalry and Friendship in the Novels of William Godwin" in *Mapping Male Sexuality: Nineteenth Century England*. Edited by Jay Losey and William D. Brewer. London: Associated University Presses, 2000: 49- 68.

Brissenden, Robert F. *Virtue in Distress: Studies in the Novel of Sentiment from Richardson to Sade*. London: Macmillan, 1974.

Bristow, Edward J. *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan Ltd., 1977.

Bruhm, Steve. *Reflecting Narcissus: A Queer Aesthetic*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.

Buckley, F. H. *The Morality of Laughter*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Bullough, Vern, Dwight Dixon and Joan Dixon. "Sadism, Masochism and history: or, When is Behaviour Sado-Masochistic?" in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*. Edited by Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004: 47-62.

Burford, E.J. *Wits, Wenchers and Wantons: London's Low Life, Convent Garden Market in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. London: R. Hale, 1986.

Burg, B.R. *Boys at Sea: Sodomy, Indecency, and Courts Martial in Nelson's Navy*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Byrn, John D. *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy: Discipline on the Leeward Islands Station, 1784-1812*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1989.

Callina, Kristina, Nancy Snow and Elise D. Murray. "The History of Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives on Hope: Toward Defining Hope for the Science of Positive Human Development," in *The Oxford Handbook of Hope*. Edited by Matthew D. Gallagher and Shane D. Lopez. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017: 9-26.

Campos Boralevi, Lea. *Bentham and the Oppressed*. Series C – Political and Social Sciences 1. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1984.

Cannadine, David. "War and Death, Grief and Mourning in Modern Britain," in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*. Edited by Joachim Whaley. London: Europa Publications, 1981: 187-242.

Carter, Philip. "Men About Town: Representations of Foppery and Masculinity in Early Eighteenth-Century Urban Society" in *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*. Edited by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus. London: Longman, 1997: 31-57.

----- *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain, 1660-1800*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001.

Cassidy, Tanya. "People, Place and Performance: Theoretically Revisiting Mother Clapp's Molly House," in *Queer People: Negotiations and Expressions of Homosexuality*. Edited by Chris Mounsey and Caroline Gonda. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007: 99-113.

Castle, Terry. "The Culture of Travesty: Sexuality and Masquerade in Eighteenth Century England" in *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*. Edited by G.S. Rousseau and Roy Porter. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.

----- *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986.

Caston, Ruth Rothaus, and Robert A. Kaster. *Hope, Joy and Affection in the Classical World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Chapman, Guy. *Beckford*. Second Edition. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1952.

Clark, Anna. *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Cochran, Peter. *Byron and Women (and Men)*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

Cocks, Harry. *Nameless Offences: Homosexual Desire in the Nineteenth Century*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2003.

----- *Visions of Sodom: Religion, Homoerotic Desire, and the End of the World in England, c. 1550-1850*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Cohen, Michèle. *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth-Century*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

----- “Manliness, effeminacy and the French: gender and the construction of national character in eighteenth-century England” in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. Edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999: 44-62.

Coleman, Patrick. *Anger, Gratitude and the Enlightenment Writer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Cook, Matt. *London and the Culture of Homosexuality, 1885-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Coontz, Stephanie. *Marriage, A History: From Obedience to Intimacy, or, How Love Conquered Marriage*. New York: Viking, 2005.

Corbin, Alain. *The Village of Cannibals: Rage and Murder in France, 1870*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Costelloe, Timothy M. *The British Aesthetic Tradition: From Shaftesbury to Wittgenstein*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Cowan, Brian. *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Crawford, Joseph. *Gothic Fiction and the Invention of Terrorism: The Politics and Aesthetics of Fear in the Age of the Reign of Terror*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Crompton, Louis. *Byron and Greek Love: Homophobia in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century England*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.

----- “Homophobia in Georgian England” in *Among Men, Among Women: Sociological and Historical recognition of homosocial arrangements*. Edited by Mattias Duyves, Myriam Everard, Saskia Grotenhuis, Gert Hekma, Paula Koelemij and Jan Willem Tellgen. Amsterdam: Grafisch Centrum Amsterdam, 1983: 235-244.

----- *Homosexuality and Civilization*. First Harvard University Press Paperback edition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Curtis, Valerie. *Don't Look, Don't Touch, Don't Eat: The Science Behind Revulsion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Dabhoiwala, Faramerz. *The Origins of Sex: A History of the First Sexual Revolution*. London: Allan Lane, 2012.



Danto, Arthur C. *The Abuse of Beauty: Aesthetics and the Concept of Art*. Chicago: Open Court, 2003.

Darcy, Jane. *Melancholy and Literary Biography, 1640-1816*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Darwin, Charles. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. London: J. Murray, 1872.

Davenport-Hines, Richard, *Sex, Death and Punishment: Attitudes to Sex and Sexuality in Britain since the Renaissance*, London: William Collins and Son, Ltd, 1990.

Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

Delumeau, Jean. *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Translated by Eric Nicholson. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Demeter, Tamas. "Anger and the Unity of Philosophy: Interlocking Discourses of Natural and Moral Philosophy in the Scottish Enlightenment," in *Discourses of Anger in the Early Modern Period*. Edited by Karl A.E. Enenkel and Anita Traninger. *Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture*, 40. Leiden: Brill, 2015: 238-258.

----- *David Hume and the Culture of Scottish Newtonianism: Methodology and Ideology in Enlightenment Inquiry*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Demos, John. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

----- "Shame and Guilt in Early New England" in *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*. Edited by Carol Z. Stearns and Peter N. Stearns. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1988: 69-85.

----- "Shame and Guilt in Early New England" in *The Emotions: Social, Cultural, and Biological Dimensions*. Edited by Rom Harré and W. Gerrod Parrot. London: Sage Publications, 1996: 74-88.

Devereaux, Simon. "Peel, Pardon and Punishment: The Recorder's Report Revisited" in *Penal Practice and Culture, 1500-1900: Policing the English*. Edited by Simon Devereaux and Paul Griffiths. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004: 258-284.

Dickie, George. *The Century of Taste: The Philosophical Odyssey of Taste in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Dixon, Thomas. *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

----- *Weeping Britannia: Portrait of a Nation in Tears*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

- Donnelly Jr., James S. *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821-1824*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge Classics Edition. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Douthwaite, Julia. *The Wild Girl, Natural Man, and the Monster: Dangerous Experiments in the Age of Enlightenment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Dubrow, Heather. *Shakespeare and Domestic Loss: Forms of Deprivation, Mourning and Recuperation*. Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Duschinsky, Robbie, Simone Schnall, and Daniel Weiss (eds). *Purity and Danger Now: New Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Dwyer, John. *The Age of the Passions: An Interpretation of Adam Smith and Scottish Enlightenment Culture*. East Lothian, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 1998.
- Dynes, Wayne R. and Stephen Donaldson (eds). *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*. New York: Garland Pub., 1992.
- Eagleton, Terry. *The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality, and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Earle, Peter. *A City Full of People: Men and Women of London 1650-1750*. London: Methuen, 1994.
- Edelman, Lee. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- "The Sodomite's Tongue and the Bourgeois Body in Eighteenth-Century England" in *Homographesis: Essays in Gay Literature and Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Eder, Markus. *Crime and Punishment in the Royal Navy of the Seven Year's War, 1755-1763*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. *Dancing in the Streets: A History of Collective Joy*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process*. 1<sup>st</sup> American Edition. New York: Urizen Books, 1978.
- Elliott, Jaklin. "What Have We Done with Hope? A History" in *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Hope*. Edited by Jaklin Elliott. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2005: 3-45.
- Elliot, David. *Hope and Christian Ethics*. New Studies in Christian Ethics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

- Ellis, Markman. *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel*. Cambridge Studies in Romanticism 18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Ellison, Julie. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Enenkel, Karl, and Anita Traninger (eds). *Discourses of Anger in the Early Modern Period*. Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture, 40. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Faflak, Joel and Richard C. Sha (eds). *Romanticism and the Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Febvre, Lucien. *A New Kind of History, and Other Essays*. Edited by Peter Burke. Translated by K. Folka. 1<sup>st</sup> Harper Torchbook Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Felsenstein, Frank. *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: A Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830*. Johns Hopkins Jewish Studies. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Fischer, Kurt and June Price Tangney. "Self-Conscious Emotions and the Affect Revolution: Framework and Overview," in *Self-conscious Emotions: The Psychology of Shame, Guilt, Embarrassment and Pride*. Edited by June Price Tangney and Kurt Fischer. New York: Guildford Press, 1995: 3-24.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Flint, Christopher. *Family Fictions: Narrative and Domestic Relations in Britain, 1688-1798*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Fone, Byrne R.S. *Homophobia: A History*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2000.
- *A Road to Stonewall: Male Homosexuality and Homophobia in English and American Literature, 1750-1969*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.
- Fothergill, Brian. *Beckford of Fonthill*. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.
- *The Strawberry Hill Set: Horace Walpole and His Circle*. London: Faber and Faber, 1983.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert J. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- *Power-Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Translated by Colin Gordon. Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1980.
- Foxon, David. *Libertine Literature in England, 1660-1745*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Publishing Group, 1965.

Foyster, Elizabeth. "Boys will be Boys? Manhood and Aggression, 1660-1800," in *English Masculinities, 1700-1800*. Edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999: 151-166.

Fraser, James W. *A History of Hope: When Americans Have Dared to Dream of a Better Future*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Frazer, Michael L. *The Enlightenment of Sympathy: Justice and the Moral Sentiments in the Eighteenth Century and Today*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

French, Henry and Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, c. 1660-1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Frevert, Ute, Christian Bailey, Pascal Eitler, et al., *Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling*. Translated from the German by Keith Tribe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Frevert, Ute. "Defining Emotions: Concepts and Debates over Three Centuries," in *Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling*. Translated by Keith Tribe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014: 3-30.

Fulkerson, Laurel. *No Regrets: Remorse in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garrett, Aaron. "Francis Hutcheson: From Moral Sense to Spectatorial Rights," in *The Concept of Love in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy*. Edited by Gabor Boros, Herman de Dijn and Martin Moors. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007: 163-180.

Gatrell, Vic. *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London*. New York: Walker and Co., 2006.

----- *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People, 1770-1868*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Gerard, Kent and Gert Hekma (eds). *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. New York: Haworth Press, 1989.

Gibson, Ian. *The English Vice: Beating, Sex, and Shame in Victorian England and After*. London: Duckworth, 1978.

Gibson, William and Joanne Begiato. *Sex and the Church in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Religion, Enlightenment and the Sexual Revolution. London: I.B. Taurus, 2017.

Gilbert, Arthur N. "Buggery and the British Navy, 1700-1861" in *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*. Edited by Wayne R. Dynes and Stephen Donaldson. Studies in Homosexuality, Volume 5, New York: Garland Publishing Inc, 1992: 132-158.

-----“Conceptions of Homosexuality and Sodomy in Western History” in *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*. Edited by Salvatore Licata and Robert Peterson. New York: Haworth Press, 1981: 57-68.

Giner-Sorolla, Roger. *Judging Passions: Moral Emotions in Persons and Groups*. London: Psychology Press, 2012.

Gilboy, Elizabeth. “Demand as a Factor in the Industrial Revolution (1932),” in *The Causes of the Industrial Revolution in England*. Edited by R.M. Hartwell. London: Methuen, 1967: 121-38.

Gill, Michael B. *The British Moralists on Human Nature and the Birth of Secular Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Gillis, John R. *For Better, For Worse: British Marriages, 1600 to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

----- “From Ritual to Romance: Towards an Alternative History of Love” in *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*. Edited by Carol Z. Stearns and Peter N. Stearns. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1988: 87- 121.

Gladfelder, Hal. *Fanny Hill in Bombay: The Making and Unmaking of John Cleland*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2012.

Goldberg, Jonathan. “Bradford’s ‘Ancient Members’ and ‘A Case of Buggery ... Amongst Them,’” in *Nationalism and Sexualities*. Edited by Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer et al. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Goldsmith, Netta Murray, “London’s Homosexuals in the Eighteenth Century: Rhetoric versus Practice”, in *Queer People: Negotiations and Expressions of Homosexuality*. Edited by Chris Mounsey and Caroline Gouda. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2007: 183-194.

----- *The Worst of Crimes: Homosexuality and the Law in 18<sup>th</sup>-Century London*. Aldershot, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 1998.

Gollapardi, Aparna. “The Disordered Fundament: Sexual Violence on Boys and Sodomy Trial Narratives in the *Old Bailey Proceedings*” in *Interpreting Sexual Violence, 1660-1800*. Edited by Anne Leah Greenfield. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014: 45-56.

Good, Cassandra A. *Founding Friendships: Friendships Between Men and Women in the Early American Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Goodich, Michael. *The Unmentionable Vice: Homosexuality in the Later Medieval Period*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1979.

Greenberg, David F. *The Construction of Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

----- “The Socio-Sexual Milieu of the Love Letters” in *Love Letters from a Certain Late Nobleman to the Famous Mr. Wilson*. Edited by Michael Kimmel. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1990: 93-103.

Greene, Frederick. “Writing Between Life and Death: Postmetaphysics and the Psychosexual Dynamics of Elegy in Shelley’s *Adonais*” in *Mapping Male Sexuality: Nineteenth Century England*. London: Associated University Presses, 2000: 123- 142.

Gregory, Jeremy. “*Homo Religious*: Masculinity and Religion in the Long Eighteenth Century” in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. Edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999: 85-110.

Gross, Daniel M. *The Secret History of Emotion: From Aristotle’s Rhetoric to Modern Brain Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Gross, Jonathan. “‘One Half What I Should Say’: Byron’s Gay Narrator in *Don Juan*” in *Mapping Male Sexuality: Nineteenth Century England*. Edited by Jay Losey and William D. Brewer. London: Associated University Presses, 2000: 91-122.

Grote, Simon. *The Emergence of Modern Aesthetic Theory: Religion and Morality in Enlightenment Germany and Scotland*. Ideas in Context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Haggerty, George E. *Horace Walpole’s Letters: Masculinity and Friendship in the Eighteenth Century*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2011.

----- “Male Love and Friendship in the Eighteenth Century” in *Love, Sex, Intimacy and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. Edited by Katherine O’Donnell and Michael O’Rourke. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007: 70-81.

----- *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Hagstrum, Jean H. *Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Halperin, David M. *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

----- “Introduction: Among Men – History, Sexuality, and the Return of Affect” in *Love, Sex, Intimacy and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. Edited by Katherine O’Donnell and Michael O’Rourke. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007: 1-11.

Halsband, Robert. *Lord Hervey: Eighteenth-Century Courtier*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Harpham, Edward J. “Gratitude in the History of Ideas,” in *The Psychology of Gratitude*. Edited by Robert A. Emmons and Michael E. McCullough. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004: 9-36.

Harris, Amy. *Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012.

Harris, William Vernon. *Restraining Rage: the Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Harvey, H.D. *Sex in Georgian England: Attitudes and Prejudices from the 1720s to the 1820s*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Harvey, Karen. "'The Majesty of the Masculine Form': Multiplicity and Male Bodies in Eighteenth-century Erotica" in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. Edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999: 193-214.

----- *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hay, Douglas. "Property, Authority and the Criminal Law," in *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England*. Edited by Douglas Hay, Peter Linebaugh, John Rule *et al.* 1<sup>st</sup> American Edition. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975: 17-63.

Hay, Douglas, Peter Linebaugh, John Rule *et al.*, *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England*. 1<sup>st</sup> American Edition. New York: Pantheon Books, 1975.

Hennen, Peter. *Faeries, Bears and Leathermen: Men in Community Queering the Masculine*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Herrup, Cynthia B. *A House in Gross Disorder: Sex, Law and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Castlehaven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Herdt, Jennifer A. *Putting On Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Herzog, Dan. *Poisoning the Minds of the Lower Orders*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Higgs, David. "Lisbon" in *Queer Sites: Gay Urban Histories since 1600*. Edited by David Higgs. London: Routledge, 1999: 112-37.

Hitchcock, Tim. *Down and Out in Eighteenth Century London*. London: Hambledon and London, 2004.

----- *English Sexualities, 1700-1800*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1997.

Hobson, Christopher Z. *Blake and Homosexuality*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2000.

Houlbrooke, Ralph A. *Death, Ritual and Bereavement*. London: Routledge, in association with the Social History Society of the United Kingdom, 1989.

Hughes, William and Andrew Smith (eds). *Queering the Gothic*. Manchester Gothic. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.

Huizinga, Johan. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Hunt, Lynn Avery. *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800*. New York: Zone Books, 1993.

Hunt, Margaret R. *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender and the Family in England, 1680-1780*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Huusen, Arend H. "Prosecution of Sodomy in Eighteenth-Century Frisia, Netherlands" in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Haworth Press, 1989: 249-62.

----- "Sodomy in the Dutch Republic During the Eighteenth Century" in *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. Edited by Martin Duberman, Martha Vincinus, and George Chauncey Jr. New York: New American Library, 1989: 141-9.

Hyde, H. Montgomery. *A History of Pornography*. London: Heinemann, 1964.

----- *The Love that Dared Not Speak Its Name: A Candid History of Homosexuality in Britain*. 1<sup>st</sup> American Edition. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.

Ingram, Allan, Stuart Sim, Clark Lawlor et al., *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth-Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Ingram, Martin. "Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England" in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*. Edited by Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996: 47-88.

Innes, Joanna. "Happiness Contested: Happiness and Politics in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries" in *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850*. Edited by M.J. Braddick and Joanna Innes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017: 87-120.

Jalland, Patricia. *Death in War and Peace: Loss and Grief in England, 1914-1970*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

James, Susan. *Passion and Action: The Emotions of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Johnson, Claudia L. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s: Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*. Women in Culture and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Jones, L.C. *The Clubs of the Georgian Rakes*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.



Jordan, Mark. D. *The Invention of Sodomy in Christian Theology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Kahan, Benjamin. *The Book of Minor Perverts: Sexology, Etiology, and the Emergences of Sexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019.

Kalimtzis, Kostas. *Taming Anger: the Hellenic Approach to the Limitations of Reason*. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2012.

Kambaskovic, Danijela. "Living Anxiously: The Senses, Society and Morality in Pre-Modern England" in *Ordering Emotions in Europe, 1100-1800*. Edited by Susan Broomhall. Leiden: Brill, 2015: 161-79.

Katz, Jonathan Ned. "The Age of Sodomitical Sin, 1607-1740" in *Reclaiming Sodom*. Edited by Jonathan Goldberg. London: Routledge, 1994: 43-58.

Kelleher, Paul. *Making Love: Sex and Sentimentality in Eighteenth Century British Literature*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2015.

Kelly, Daniel R. *Yuck! The Nature and Moral Significance of Disgust*. Life and Mind: Philosophical Issues in Biology and Psychology. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011.

Kennedy, Gwynne. *Just Anger: Representing Women's Anger in Early Modern England*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000.

King, Peter. *Crime and Law in England, 1750-1840: Remaking Justice from the Margins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

King, Thomas. *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750: The English Phallus*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.

Kinservik, Matthew. *Sex, Scandal, and Celebrity in Late Eighteenth-Century England*. The New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Kitamaya, Shinobu, Hazel Rose Markus, and Hisaya Matsumoto. "Culture, Self and Emotion: A Cultural Perspective on 'Self-Conscious' Emotions" in *Self Conscious Emotions: The Psychology of Shame, Guilt, Embarrassment, and Pride*. Edited by June Price Tangney and Kurt W. Fischer. New York: Guilford Press, 1995: 439-464.

Kivy, Peter. *The Seventh Sense: Francis Hutcheson and Eighteenth-Century British Aesthetics*. Second Edition: Revised and Enlarged. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.

Klein, Lawrence Eliot. *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Knight, Charlotte and Kath Wilson. *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans People (LGBT) and the Criminal Justice System*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

- Knight, G. Wilson. *Lord Byron's Marriage: The Evidence of Asterisks*. Routledge Library Edition. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 2016 [1957].
- Kolnai, Aurel. *On Disgust (1929)*. Edited by Barry Smith and Carolyn Korsmeyer. Chicago: Open Court, 2004.
- Kopelson, Kevin. "Seeing Sodomy: Fanny Hill's Blinding Vision" in *Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment England: Literary Representations in Historical Context*. Edited by Claude J. Summers. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1992: 173–184.
- Korsmeyer, Carolyn. *Savoring Disgust: The Foul and the Fair in Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. European Perspectives. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.
- *Powers of Horror: An Essay in Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Kuchar, Gary. *The Poetry of Religious Sorrow in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kuchta, David. *The Three-Piece Suit and Modern Masculinity: England, 1550-1850*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Kuefler, Mathew. *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Lacey, Brian. *Terrible Queer Creatures: Homosexuality in Irish History*. Dublin: Wordwell Books, 2008.
- Lake, Peter. "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice" in *Conflict in Early Stuart Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*. Edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes. London: Longman, 1989: 72-97.
- Landau, Norma. "The Trading Justice's Trade" in *Law, Crime and English Society, 1660-1830*. Edited by Norma Landau. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002: 46-70.
- Langford, Paul. *Public life and the Propertied Englishman, 1689-1798*. Ford Lectures, 1990. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Laqueur, Thomas W. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- "Sex and Desire in the Industrial Revolution" in *The Industrial Revolution and British Society*. Edited by Patrick K. O'Brien and Roland Quinault. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993:100-123.
- *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation*. New York: Zone Books, 2003.

Laslett, Peter, Karla Oosterveen and Richard Michael Smith (eds). *Bastardy and Its Comparative History: Studies in the History of Illegitimacy and Marital Nonconformism in Britain, France, Germany, Sweden, North America, Jamaica and Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980).

Laslett, Peter. *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations: Essays in Historical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Lateiner, Donald and Demos G. Spatharas (eds). *The Ancient Emotion of Disgust*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Lawlor, Clark. "Fashionable Melancholy" in *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*. Edited by Allan Ingram, Stuart Sim, Clark Lawlor *et al.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011: 25-53.

----- *From Melancholia to Prozac: A History of Depression*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Leithart, Peter J. *Gratitude: An Intellectual History*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.

Lemmens, Willem. "Philosophy as Medicina Mentis?" in *The Concept of Love in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy*. Edited by Gabor Boros, Herman de Dijn and Martin Moors. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007: 181-204.

Lewis, Brian (ed). *British Queer History: New Approaches and Perspectives*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.

Light, Caroline E. *That Pride of Race and Character: The Roots of Jewish Benevolence in the Jim Crow South*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.

Linebaugh, Peter. *The London Hanged: Crime and Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Verso, 2006.

Lord, Evelyn. *The Hell-Fire Clubs: Sex, Satanism, and Secret Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Losey, Jay and William D. Brewer (eds). *Mapping Male Sexuality: Nineteenth Century England*. London: Associated University Presses, 2000.

Lovejoy, Arthur O. *Essays in the History of Ideas*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1948.

----- *Reflections on Human Nature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961.

Lutz, Catherine. *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll & Their Challenge to Western Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

- Lyons, Bridget Gellert. *Voices of Melancholy: Studies in Literary Treatments of Melancholy in Renaissance England*. Ideas and Forms in English Literature. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1971.
- Mack, Phyllis. *Heart Religion in the British Enlightenment: Gender and Emotion in Early Methodism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Mackie, Erin Skye. *Rakes, Highwaymen and Pirates: The Making of the Modern Gentleman in the Eighteenth-Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Marshall, John. *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Matt, Susan J. *Keeping Up with the Joneses: Envy in American Consumer Society, 1890-1930*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Maurer, Shawn L. *Proposing Men: Dialectics of Gender and Class in the Eighteenth-Century English Periodical*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- May, Simon. *Love: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- McFarlane, Cameron. *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire, 1660-1750*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb. *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- McLaren, Angus. *Sexual Blackmail: A Modern History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- McLynn, Frank. *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- McMahon, Darrin M. *Happiness: A History*. New York: Grove Press, 2006.
- Mengay, Donald H. "The Sodomitical Muse: Fanny Hill and the Rhetoric of Crossdressing" in *Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment England: Literary Representations in Historical Context*. Edited by Claude J. Summers. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1992: 185-198.
- Menninghaus, Winifried. *Disgust: The Theory and History of a Strong Sensation*. Translated by Howard Eiland and Joel Golb. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Miller, Susan B. *Disgust: The Gatekeeper Emotion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, 2004.
- Miller, William Ian. *The Anatomy of Disgust*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

----- *Humiliation: And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort and Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Mirguet, Françoise. *An Early History of Compassion: Emotion and Imagination in Hellenistic Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Mitchison, Rosalind and Leah Leneman. *Girls in Trouble: Sexuality and Social Control in Rural Scotland, 1660-1780*. Newbattle, UK: Scottish Cultural Press, 1998.

----- *Sin in the City: Sexuality and Social Control in Urban Scotland, 1660-1780*. Newbattle, UK: Scottish Cultural Press, 1998.

Mitterauer, Michael. "The Customs of the Magians: the Problem of Incest in Historical Societies" in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*. Edited by Roy Porter and Mikulaus Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Mittleman, Alan. *Hope in a Democratic Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*. 1<sup>st</sup> U.S. Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Monter, E. William. "Sodomy and Heresy in Early Modern Switzerland" in *Historical Perspectives on Homosexuality*. Edited by Salvatore Licata and Robert Peterson. New York: Haworth Press, 1981: 41-55.

Moran, Leslie J. *The Homosexual(ity) of Law*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Morris, Polly. "Sodomy and Male Honor: The Case of Somerset, 1740-1850" in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1989: 383-406.

Mosse, George L. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Mowl, Timothy. *Horace Walpole: The Great Outsider*. London: Murray, 1996.

Muellner, Leonard Charles. *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic. Myth and Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Mullan, John. *Sentiment and Sociability: the Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Naphy, William G. and Penny Roberts (eds). *Fear in Early Modern Society*. Studies in Early Modern European History. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Nash, David and Kildare, Anne-Marie. *Cultures of Shame: Exploring Crime and Morality in Britain, 1600-1900*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

- Nash, Richard. *Wild Enlightenment: The Borders of Human Identity in the Eighteenth Century*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003.
- Nathanson, Donald L. *Shame and Pride: Affect, Sex, and the Birth of the Self*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1992.
- Nef, John U. *Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization*. Wiles Lectures. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.
- Newman, Paul. *A History of Terror: Fear & Dread Through the Ages*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000.
- Noordam, Dirk Jaap. "Sodomy in the Dutch Republic, 1600-1725" in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Haworth Press, 1989: 207-27.
- Norton, Brian Michael. *Fiction and the Philosophy of Happiness: Ethical Inquiries in the Age of Enlightenment*. Transits: literature, thought & culture. Lewisburg, PA; Lanham, MD: Bucknell University Press; Co-Published with the Rowman & Littlefield Pub. Group, 2012.
- Norton, Rictor. *Mother Clap's Molly House: The Gay Subculture in England 1700-1830*, London: GMP Press, 1992
- *Myth of the Modern Homosexual: Queer History and the Search for Cultural Unity*, London: Cassell, 1997.
- Norton, Rictor (ed). *My Dear Boy: Gay Love Letters Through the Centuries*. San Francisco: Leyland Publications, 1998.
- Nussbaum, Martha. *Hiding from Humanity: Disgust, Shame, and the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- *The Monarchy of Fear: A Philosopher Looks at our Political Crisis*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2018.
- O'Donnell, Katherine and Michael O'Rourke (eds). *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship between Men, 1550-1800*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Ogborn, Miles. *Spaces of Modernity: London's Geographies, 1680-1780*. New York: Guildford Press, 1998.
- Oliver, John Walter. *The Life of William Beckford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Parris, Matthew. *The Great Unfrosted: Two Thousand Years of Church Scandal*. Edited by Nick Angel. London: Robson Books, 1998.
- Partridge, Bruno. *A History of Orgies*. SevenOaks Edition. London: SevenOaks, 2005 [1958].

- Patterson, Craig "The Rage of Caliban: Eighteenth-Century Molly Houses and the Twentieth-Century Search for Sexual Identity" in *Illicit Sex: Identity Politics in Early Modern Culture*. Edited by Thomas DiPiero and Pat Gill. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1997: 256-270.
- Peakman, Julie. *Amatory Pleasures: Explorations in Eighteenth-Century Sexual Culture*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.
- *Lascivious Bodies: A Sexual History of the Eighteenth Century*. London: Atlantic Books, 2004.
- *Mighty Lewd Books: The Development of Pornography in Eighteenth-Century England*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- *The Pleasure's All Mine: A History of Perverse Sex*. London: Reaktion Books, 2013.
- Piers, Gerhart, and Milton B. Singer. *Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study*. New York: Norton, 1971.
- Plamper, Jan. *The History of Emotions: An Introduction*. Translated by Keith Tribe. Emotions in History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Porter, Roy. "Mixed Feelings: The Enlightenment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain" in *Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Edited by Paul-Gabriel Boucé. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982: 1-27.
- Porter, Roy and Lesley Hall. *The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Britain, 1650-1950*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Porter, Roy and Mikulas Teich (eds). *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Potkay, Adam. *The Passion for Happiness: Samuel Johnson and David Hume*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- *The Story of Joy: From the Bible to Late Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Probert, Rebecca (ed). *Cohabitation and Non-Marital Births in England and Wales, 1600-2012*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Rabin, Dana Y. *Identity, Crime, and Legal Responsibility in Eighteenth-Century England*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Read, Sara. "'Only Kept up by the Credulous and Ignorant': Eighteenth-Century Responses to the Ancient Beliefs about Menstrual Blood" in *Great Expectations: Futurity in the Long Eighteenth-Century*. Edited by Mascha Hanson and Jurgen Klein. Britannia. Bern: Peter Lang, 2012: 205-222.

Reddy, William. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Reynolds, Elaine A., *Before the Bobbies: the Night Watch and Police Reform in Metropolitan London, 1720-1832*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Roberts, Marie Mulvey. "Pleasures Engendered by Gender: Homosociality and the Club" in *Pleasure in the Eighteenth Century*. Edited by Roy Porter and Marie Mulvey Roberts. Houndmills, Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 1996: 48-76.

Robin, Corey. *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Robinson, David M. *Closeted Writing and Lesbian and Gay Literature: Classical, Early Modern, Eighteenth-Century*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006.

Rodger, N.A.M. *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy*. New York: Norton, 1996.

Rogers, Nicholas. *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.

----- *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Rousseau, George. "'Homoplutonic, Homodepressed, Homomorbid': Some Further Genealogies of Same-Sex Attraction in Western Civilization" in *Love, Sex, Intimacy and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. Edited by Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007: 12-52.

----- "'In the House of Madam Vander Tasse, on the Long Bridge': A Homosocial University Club in Early Modern Europe" in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1990: 311-47.

----- *Perilous Enlightenment: Pre- and Post-Modern Discourses*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.

----- "The Pursuit of Homosexuality in the Eighteenth Century: 'Utterly Confused Category' and/or Rich Repository?" in *'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality During the Enlightenment*. Edited Robert P. MacCubbin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988: 132-68.

----- "The Sorrows of Priapus: Anticlericalism, Homosocial Desire, and Richard Payne Knight" in *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*. Edited by George Rousseau and Roy Porter. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987: 101-153.



Rousseau, George and Roy Porter (eds). *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.

Rubini, Dennis. "Sexuality and Augustan England: Sodomy, Politics, Elite Circles and Society" in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1989: 349-382.

Rudé, George F. E. *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848*. Rev. Edition. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1981.

Rule, John. *The Experience of Labour in Eighteenth-Century Industry*. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Ryan, David. *Blasphemers & Blackguards: The Irish Hellfire Clubs*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2012.

Rydstrom, Jens. *Sinners and Citizens: Bestiality and Homosexuality in Sweden, 1880-1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Sacco, Lynn. *Unspeakable: Father-Daughter Incest in American History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.

Sarkhosh, Keyvan. ">>Sick, sick, sick<<?: Pornography, Disgust, and the Limit Values of Aesthetics" in *Quote, Double Quote: Aesthetics between High and Popular Culture*. Edited by Keyvan Sarkhosh and Paul Ferstl. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014: 99-120.

Scheer, Monique. "Topographies of Emotion" in *Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change and in the Vocabulary of Emotions*. Edited by Ute Frevert, Christian Bailey, Pascal Eitler *et al.* Translated by Keith Tribe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014: 32-61.

Schmidt, Jeremy. *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England*. The History of Medicine in Context. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.

Schmitter, Amy M. "Family Trees: Sympathy, Comparison, and the Proliferation of the Passions in Hume and his Predecessors" in *Emotion and Cognitive Life in Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy*. Edited by Martin Pickavé and Lisa Shapiro. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012: 255-278.

Schor, Esther. *Bearing the Dead: the British Culture of Mourning from the Enlightenment to Victoria*. Literature in History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Seifert, Lewis Carl and Rebecca May Wilkin (eds). *Men and Women Making Friends in Early Modern France*. London: Routledge, 2016.

Senelick, Laurence. "Mollies or Men of Mode? Sodomy and the Eighteenth-Century London Stage" in Wayne R. Dynes and Stephen Donaldson (eds), *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*, Studies in Homosexuality, Volume 5, New York: Garland Publishing Inc, 1992: 287-322.

Sha, Richard C. "Blake and the Queering of Jouissance" in *Queer Blake*. Edited by Helen P. Bruder and Tristanne Connolly. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010: 40-48.

Shackleton, Robert. *The Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number: The History of Bentham's Phrase*. Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 90. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1972.

Shankman, Steven. *Pope's 'Illiad': Homer in the Age of Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Shapiro, Stephen. "Of Mollies: Class and Same-Sex Sexualities in the Eighteenth Century" in *In a Queer Place: Sexuality and Belonging in British and European Contexts*. Edited by Kate Chedgzoy, Emma Francis and Murray Pratt. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2002: 155-176.

Shoemaker, Robert. *The London Mob: Violence and Disorder in Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Hambledon and London, 2004.

----- "Reforming Male Manners: Public Insult and the Decline of Violence in London, 1660-1740" in *English Masculinities, 1700-1800*. Edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1999: 133-150.

----- "Streets of Shame? The Crowd and Public Punishments in London, 1700-1820" in *Penal Practice and Culture, 1500-1900: Punishing the English*. Edited by Simon Devereaux and Paul Griffiths. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004: 232-257.

Shorter, Edward. *The Making of the Modern Family*. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Simpson, Antony E. "Blackmail as a Crime of Sexual Indiscretion in Eighteenth-Century England" in *Crime, Gender, and Sexuality in Criminal Prosecutions*. Edited by Louis A. Knafla. Criminal Justice History 17. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002: 61-86.

Sinhababu, Neil. *Humean Nature: How Desire Explains Action, Thought, and Feeling*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Sitter, John E. *Literary Loneliness in Mid-Eighteenth Century England*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Smith, Greg T. "Civilized People Don't Want to See That Sort of Thing: The Decline of Physical Punishment in London, 1760-1840" in *Qualities of Mercy: Justice, Punishment,*

*and Discretion*. Edited by Carolyn Strange. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 1996: 21-51.

Sombert, Werner. *Luxury and Capitalism*. Translated by W. R. Dittmar. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967 [1913].

Soni, Vivasvan. *Mourning Happiness: Narrative and the Politics of Modernity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010.

Spinks, Jennifer and Charles Zika. *Disaster, Death and the Emotions in the Shadow of the Apocalypse, 1400-1700*. Palgrave Studies in the History of Emotions. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Stead, Henry. *A Cockney Catullus: The Reception of Catallus in Romantic Britain, 1795-1821*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Stearns, Peter N. and Carol Z. (eds). *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1988.

Stearns, Peter N. and Carol Z. *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stearns, Carol Zisowitz. "'Lord Help Me Walk Humbly': Anger and Sadness in England and America, 1570-1750" in *Emotion and Social Change: Toward a New Psychohistory*. Edited by Peter N. and Carol Z. Stearns. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1988: 39-68.

Stearns, Peter N. *American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style*. History of Emotion Series 3. New York: New York University Press, 1994.

----- *American Fear: The Causes and Consequences of High Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

----- *Jealousy: The Evolution of an Emotion in American History*. New York: University Press, 1989.

Steintrager, James. *Cruel Delight: Enlightenment Culture and the Inhuman*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2004.

Stengers, Jean and Anne Van Neck. *Masturbation: The History of a Great Terror*. Translated by Kathryn Hoffmann. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2001.

Stevenson, David. *The Beggar's Benison: Sex Clubs of Enlightenment Scotland and their Rituals*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2001.

Stewart, Alan. "A Society of Sodomites: Religion and Homosexuality in Renaissance England" in *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300-1800*. Edited by Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter and M. Rubin. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005: 88-109.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.

----- *Uncertain Unions: Marriage in England, 1660-1753*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Straub, Kristina. *Domestic Affairs: Intimacy, Eroticism, and Violence between Servants and Masters in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.

----- *Sexual Suspects: Eighteenth-Century Players and Sexual Ideology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Sullivan, Erin. *Beyond Melancholy: Sadness and Selfhood in Renaissance England*. Emotions in History. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Swiss, Margo and David A. Kent (eds). *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton*. Medieval & Renaissance Literary Studies. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2002.

Tadmor, Naomi. *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship and Patronage*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Taussig, Gurion. *Coleridge and the Idea of Friendship, 1789-1804*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2002.

TenHouten, Warren D. *Emotions and the Social*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Terry, Richard. "Philosophical Melancholy" in *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660-1800*. Edited by Allan Ingram, Stuart Sim and Clark Lawlor *et al.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011: 54-82.

Thompson, E.P. *Customs in Common*. London: Merlin Press, 1991.

Tilmouth, Christopher. *Passion's Triumph over Reason: A History of the Moral Imagination from Spenser to Rochester*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Townshend, Dale. "'Love in a Convent': Or, Gothic and the Perverse Father of Queer Enjoyment" in *Queering the Gothic*. Edited by William Hughes and Andrew Smith. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017: 11-35.

Trevor, Douglas. *The Poetics of Melancholy in Early Modern England*. Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Trumbach, Randolph. "The Birth of the Queen: Sodomy and the Emergence of Gender Equality in Modern Culture, 1660-1750" in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. Edited by Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus and George Chauncey Jr. New York: Meridian, 1989: 129-140.

----- “The Heterosexual Male in Eighteenth-Century London and his Queer Interactions” in *Love, Sex, Intimacy and Friendship Between Men, 1550-1800*. Edited by Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007: 99-127.

----- “Gender and the Homosexual Role in Modern Western Culture: the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries Compared” in *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?* Edited by Dennis Altman, Carole Vance *et al.* International Conference on Gay and Lesbian Studies, London: GMP Publishers, 1989: 149-170.

----- “London” in *Queer Sites: Gay Urban Histories since 1600*. Edited by David Higgs. London: Routledge, 1999: 89-111.

----- “Modern prostitution and gender in *Fanny Hill*: Libertine and Domesticated Fantasy” in G.S. Rousseau and Roy Porter (eds). *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987: 69-85.

----- “Modern Sodomy: the Origins of Homosexuality, 1700-1800” in *A Gay History of Britain: Love and Sex Between Men Since the Middle Ages*. Edited by Matt Cook. Oxford: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007.

----- *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth-Century England*. Studies in Social Discontinuity. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

----- *Sex and the Gender Revolution: Volume 1, Heterosexuality and the Third Gender in Enlightenment London* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998

----- “Sodomitical Assaults, Gender Role, and Sexual Development in Eighteenth-Century London” in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1989: 407-432.

----- “Sodomitical Subcultures, Sodomitical Roles, and the Gender Revolution of the Eighteenth Century: The Recent Historiography” in *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*. Edited by Wayne R. Dynes and Stephen Donaldson. Studies in Homosexuality 5. New York: Garland Publishing Inc, 1992: 387-400.

----- “Sodomy Transformed: Aristocratic Libertinage, Public Reputation and the Gender Revolution of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century” in *Love Letters from a Certain Late Nobleman to the Famous Mr. Wilson*. Edited by Michael Kimmel. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1990: 105-124.

Upchurch, Charles. *Before Wilde: Sex between Men in Britain's Age of Reform*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009.

----- “Politics and the Reporting of Sex Between Men in the 1820s” in *Queer British History*. Edited by Brian Lewis. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013: 17- 38.

Van der Meer, Theo. "The Persecutions of Sodomites in Eighteenth-Century Amsterdam: Changing Perceptions of Sodomy" in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. New York: Haworth Press, 1989: 263-307.

Van Sant, Ann Jessie. *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Wagner, Peter. *Eros Revived: Erotica of the Enlightenment in England and America*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1988.

-----"The Pornographer in the Courtroom: Trial Reports about cases of Sexual Crimes and Delinquencies as a genre of Eighteenth-Century Erotica" in *Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Edited by Paul-Gabriel Boucé. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982: 120-141.

Wahrman, Dror. *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Walsh, Chris. *Cowardice: A Brief History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

----- "The Happiness of Suffering" in *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850*. Edited by M.J. Braddick and Joanna Innes. The First Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017: 45-78.

Ward, Peter A. *British Naval Power in the East, 1794-1805: The Command of Admiral Peter Rainier*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2013.

Watkin, William. *On Mourning: Theories of Loss in Modern Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1957.

Weeks, Jeffrey. *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the 19<sup>th</sup> Century to the Present*. London: Quartet Books, 1977.

Weisfeld, Glenn E. and Lisa M. Dillon. "Applying the Dominance Hierarchy Model to Pride and Shame, and Related Behaviors." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 10 (1) 2012: 15-41.

Wheatley, Henry Benjamin and Peter Cunningham. *London Past and Present: Its History, Associations and Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

White, Jerry. *London in the Eighteenth Century: A Great and Monstrous Thing*. London: The Bodley Head, 2012.

Williams, Craig A. *Roman Homosexuality*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Wilson, Catherine. "Love of God and Love of Creatures: The Masham-Astell Exchange" in Gabor Boros, Herman De Dijn and Martin Moors (eds). *The Concept of Love in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007: 125-140.

----- "The Theory and Regulation of Love in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy" in Gabor Boros, Herman De Dijn and Martin Moors (eds). *The Concept of Love in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007: 141-162.

Wilson, Robert Rawdon. *The Hydra's Tale: Imagining Disgust*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2002.

Withington, Phil. "The Invention of 'Happiness'" in *Suffering and Happiness in England 1550-1850*. Edited by M.J. Braddick and Joanna Innes. The First Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017: 23-56.

Wolf, Naomi. *Outrages: Sex, Censorship, and the Criminalization of Love*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2020.

Woodforde, John. *The History of Vanity*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Yeazell, Ruth Bernard. *Fictions of Modesty: Women and Courtship in the English Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

### **Journal Articles.**

Alberti, Fay Bound. "This 'Modern Epidemic': Loneliness as an Emotion Cluster and a Neglected Subject in the History of Emotions." *Emotion Review* 10 (3) 2018: 242-254.

Andrew, Donna T. "The Secularization of Suicide in England, 1660-1800." *Past and Present* 119 (May 1988): 158-165.

Azfar, Farid. "Beastly Sodomites and the Shameless Urban Future." *The Eighteenth Century* 55 (4) 2014: 391-410.

----- "Genealogy of An Execution: The Sodomite, the Bishop, and the Anomaly of 1726" *The Journal of British Studies* 51 (3) 2012: 568-593.

Baer, James A. "God and the Nation: Protestants, Patriotism and Pride in Cuba, 1890-1906." *International Journal of Cuban Studies* 8 (1) 2016: 74-96.

Bartlett, Peter. "Sodomites in the Pillory in Eighteenth-Century London," *Social & Legal Studies* 6 (4), 1997:553-572.

Biess, Frank. "'Everybody has a Chance': Nuclear Angst, Civil Defence, and the History of Emotions in Postwar West Germany." *German History* 27 (2) 2009: 215-43.

- Blauvelt, Martha Tomhave. "The Work of the Heart: Emotion in the 1805-1835 Diary of Sarah Connell Ayer." *Journal of Social History* 35 (3) 2002: 577-92.
- Bohstedt, John. "Gender, Household, and Community Politics: Women in English Riots 1790-1810." *Past and Present* 120 (1) 1988: 88-122.
- Bourke, Joanna. "Fear and Anxiety: Writing about Emotion in Modern History." *History Workshop Journal* 55 (Spring 2003): 111-133.
- Broussois, Lisa. "Francis Hutcheson on Luxury and Intemperance: The Mandeville Threat." *History of European Ideas* 41 (8) 2015: 1093-1106.
- Brunstrom, Conrad. "'Leaving the Herd': How Queer Was Cowper?" *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29 (2006): 157-67.
- Burch, Charles Eaton. "Defoe and the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners." *Review of English Studies* 16 (63) 1940, 306-312.
- Burg, B.R. "The H.M.S. *Africane* Revisited: The Royal Navy and the Homosexual Community." *Journal of Homosexuality* 56 (2009): 173-194.
- "Ho, Hum, Another Work of the Devil: Buggery and Sodomy in Early Stuart England." *Journal of Homosexuality*, 6 (1-2) 1981: 69-78.
- "Sodomy, Masturbation, and Courts-Martial in the Antebellum American Navy." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 23 (1) 2014: 53-78.
- Burns, J.H. "Happiness and Utility: Jeremy Bentham's Equation." *Utilitas* 17 (1) 2005: 46-61.
- Camenisch, Paul F. "Gift and Gratitude in Ethics." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 9 (1) 1981: 1-34.
- Campbell, Jill. "'I Am No Giant': Horace Walpole, Heterosexual Incest, and Love Among Men." *The Eighteenth Century* 39 (3) 1998: 238-260.
- Carter, Philip. "An 'Effeminate' or 'Efficient' Nation? Masculinity and Eighteenth-Century Social Commentary." *Textual Practise* 11 (3) 1997: 429-443.
- Cartwright, John. "From Aquinas to Zwelethemba: A Brief History of Hope." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 592 (1) 2004: 166-184.
- Cash, Arthur H. "Wilkes, Baxter and D'Holbach at Leiden and Utrecht: An Answer to G. S. Rousseau." *The Age of Johnson* 7 (1996): 397-426.
- Castillo, Greg. "Making a Spectacle of Restraint: The Deutschland Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels Exposition." *Journal of Contemporary History* 47 (1) 2012: 97-119.



- Cavaille, Jean-Pierre. "Libertine and Libertinism: Polemic Uses of the Terms in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English and Scottish Literature." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 12 (2) 2012: 12-36.
- Chen, Jeng-Guo S. "Gendering India: Effeminacy and the Scottish Enlightenment's Debates over Virtue and Luxury." *The Eighteenth Century* 51 (1/2) 2010: 193-210.
- Clark, Anna. "The Chevalier d'Eon and Wilkes: Masculinity and Politics in the Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32 (1) 1998: 19-48.
- "The Sexual Crisis and Popular Religion in London, 1770-1820." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 34 (Fall 1988): 56-69.
- Cocks, Harry. "Making the Sodomite Speak: Voices of the Accused in English Sodomy Trials, c. 1800-98." *Gender & History* 18 (1) 2006: 87-107.
- "Safeguarding Civility: Sodomy, Class and Moral Reform in Early Nineteenth-Century England," *Past & Present* 190 (2006): 121-146.
- Collier, Mark. "Hume's Science of Emotions: Feeling Theory without Tears." *Hume Studies* 37 (1) 2012: 3-18.
- Cowan, Brian. "Reasonable Ecstasies: Shaftesbury and the Languages of Libertinism." *Journal of British Studies* 37 (2) 1998: 111-138.
- Crawford, Patricia. "Attitudes to Menstruation in Seventeenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 91 (1) 1981: 47-73.
- Culme, John. "Trade in Fancy: New Findings from Eighteenth Century London." *Silver Society Journal* 12 (2000): 98-110.
- Dabhoiwala, Faramerz. "Lust and Liberty," *Past & Present* 207 (1) 2010: 89-179.
- "Sex and Societies for Moral Reform, 1688-1800," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2) 2007: 290-319.
- Davis, Evan. "'A Full and Exact Relation': Sodomy, Authenticity, and Publication in the Narrative of the Marooned Dutchman." *The Eighteenth Century* 44 (2/3) 2003: 257-278.
- Denlinger, Elizabeth Campbell. "The Garment and the Man: Masculine Desire in Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies, 1764-1793." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 11 (3) 2002: 357-394.
- Deters, Anna. "'Glorious Perverseness': Stoic Pride and Domestic Heroism in Richardson's Novels." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 26 (1) 2013: 67-92.
- Diamond, Lisa M. "What Does Sexual Orientation Orient? A Biobehavioural Model Distinguishing Romantic and Sexual Desire." *Psychological Review* 110 (1) 2003: 173-192.

- Dickey, Laurence. "Pride, Hypocrisy & Civility in Mandeville's Social and Historical Theory." *Critical Review* 4 (3) 1990: 387-431.
- Dixon, Thomas. "The Tears of Mr. Justice Willes." *Journal of Victorian Culture* 17 (1) 2012: 1-23.
- Drucker, Peter. "Byron and Ottoman Love: Orientalism, Europeanization and Same-Sex Sexualities in the Early Nineteenth-Century Levant." *Journal of European Studies* 42 (2) 2012: 140-157.
- Dwan, David. "Edmund Burke and the Emotions." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 72 (4) 2011: 571-593.
- Dyer, Gary. "The Arrest of Caleb Williams: Unnatural Crime, Constructive Violence, and Overwhelming Terror in Late Eighteenth-Century England," *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 36 (3), 2012: 31-56.
- Ellenzweig, Sarah. "The Faith of Unbelief: Rochester's 'Satyre,' Deism, and Religious Freethinking the Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of British Studies* 44 (1) 2005: 27-45.
- Elton, Maria. "Self-Love in Adam Smith and the Stoic Oikeiosis." *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought* 32 (1) 2015: 191-212.
- Febvre, Lucien. "La sensibilité et l'histoire: Comment reconstituer la vie affective d'autrefois?" *Annales d'histoire sociale* 3 (1/2) 1941: 5-20.
- Feldman, Martha. "Denaturing the Castrato." *The Opera Quarterly* 24 (3/4) 2009: 178-199.
- Fiering, Norman S. "Irresistible Compassion: An Aspect of Eighteenth-Century Sympathy and Humanitarianism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37 (2) 1976: 196-218.
- Flynn, Maureen. "Blasphemy and the Play of Anger in Sixteenth-Century Spain." *Past and Present* 149 (1) 1995: 29-56.
- Foster, Thomas A. "Antimasonic Satire, Sodomy, and Eighteenth-Century Masculinity in the "Boston Evening Post." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 60 (1) 2003: 171-184.
- Frantzen, Allen J. "The Disclosure of Sodomy in Cleanness." *PLMA* 111 (3) 1996: 451-464.
- French, Henry. "The Search for the 'Middle Sort of People' in England, 1600-1800." *Historical Journal* 43 (1) 2000: 277-293.
- Gane, Susan. "Common Soldiers, Same-Sex Love and Religion in the Early Eighteenth-Century British Army," *Gender & History* 25 (3) 2013: 637-651.
- Garro, Linda C. "Comment on William M. Reddy, Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions." *Current Anthropology* 38 (3) 1997: 341-2.

- Garvey, Stephen P. "Can Shaming Punishments Educate?" *University of Chicago Review* 65 (3) 1998: 733-794.
- Gidal, Eric. "Civic Melancholy: English Gloom and French Enlightenment." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37 (1) 2003: 23-45.
- Gilbert, Arthur N. "The Africaine Courts-Martial: A Study of Buggery and the British Navy" *Journal of Homosexuality* 1 (1974): 111-22.
- "Sexual Deviance and Disaster during the Napoleonic Wars" *Albion* 9 (1) 1977: 98-113.
- "Sodomy and the Law in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Britain" *Societas* 8 (3) 1978: 225-241.
- Gill, Ellen. "'Children of the Service': Paternalism, Patronage, and Friendship in the George Navy." *Journal for Maritime Research* 15 (2) 2013: 149-165.
- Gill, Michael B. "Humean Sentimentalism and Non-Consequentialist Moral Thinking." *Hume Studies* 37 (2) 2013: 165-88.
- "Love of Humanity in Shaftesbury's Moralists." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 24 (6) 2016: 1117-35.
- Gladfelder, Hal. "In Search of Lost Texts: Thomas Cannon's *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplified*." *Eighteenth Century Life* 31 (1) 2007: 22-38.
- Goldsmith, M.M. "Public Virtue and Private Vices: Bernard Mandeville and English Political Ideologies in the Early Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth Century Studies* 9 (4) 1976: 477-510.
- Greene, Jody. "Public Secrets: Sodomy and the Pillory in the Eighteenth-Century and Beyond." *The Eighteenth-Century* 44 (2/3), 2003: 203-232.
- Gregg, Stephen H. "Male Friendship and Defoe's Captain Singleton: 'My Every Thing.'" *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies* 27 (2) 2004: 203-18.
- Griswold, Charles and Douglas J. Den Uyl. "Adam Smith on Friendship and Love." *Review of Metaphysics* 49 (3) 1996: 609-37.
- Haggerty, George E. "Horace Walpole's Epistolary Friendships." *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29 (2006): 201-218.
- "Keyhole Testimony: Witnessing Sodomy in the Eighteenth Century." *The Eighteenth Century* 44 (2/3) 2003: 167-82.
- "Queering Horace Walpole." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46 (3) 2006: 543-62.

----- “Smollett’s World of Masculine Desire in ‘The Adventures of Roderick Random.’” *The Eighteenth Century* 53 (3) 2012: 317-330.

Halliday, Robert. “The Roadside Burial of Suicides: An East Anglian Study.” *Folklore* 121 (1) 2010: 81-93.

Halsey, Katie. “The Blush of Modesty or the Blush of Shame? Reading Jane Austen’s Blushes.” *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 42 (3) 2006: 226-38.

Harris, Victoria. “Sex on the Margins: New Directions in the Historiography of Sexuality and Gender.” *The Historical Journal* 53 (4) 2010: 1085-1104.

Harvey, H. D. “Prosecutions for Sodomy in England at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.” *The Historical Journal* 21 (4), 1978: 939-948.

Henderson, Robert S. “David Hume on Personal Identity and the Indirect Passions.” *Hume Studies* 16 (1) 2011:33-44.

Herrup, Cynthia. “The Patriarch at Home: The Trial of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Castlehaven for Rape and Sodomy.” *History Workshop Journal* 41 (1996): 1-18.

Hill, Lisa and Peter McCarthy. “On Friendship and Necessitudo in Adam Smith.” *History of the Human Sciences* 17 (4) 2004: 1-16.

Hitchcock, Tim. “Redefining Sex in Eighteenth-Century England.” *History Workshop Journal* 41 (1) 1996: 72-90.

----- “The Reformulation of Sexual Knowledge in Eighteenth-Century England.” *Signs* 37 (4) 2012: 823-832.

Hunt, Lynn and Margaret C. Jacob. “The Affective Revolution in 1790s Britain.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 34 (4) 2001: 491-522.

Kalt, Stefan. “David Hume on the Motivating Effect of Moral Perception: Internalist or Externalist?” *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 22 (2) 2005: 143-160.

Kelleher, Paul. “Reason, Madness and Sexuality in the British Public Sphere.” *The Eighteenth-Century*, 53 (3), 2012: 291-315.

Kelly, Jason M. “Riots, Revelries, and Rumor: Libertinism and Masculine Association in Enlightenment England.” *Journal of British Studies* 45 (4) 2006: 759-795.

Kemp, Simon and K.T. Strongman. “Anger Theory and Management: A Historical Analysis.” *American Journal of Psychology* 108 (3) 1995: 397-417.

Kinservik, Matthew. “The Politics and Poetics of Sodomy in the Age of George III.” *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29 (2006): 219-236.

----- “Satire, Censorship, and Sodomy in Samuel Foote’s ‘The Capuchin’ (1776).” *The Review of English Studies* 54 (217) 2003: 639-660.

- Kolnai, Aurel. "The Standard Modes of Aversion: Fear, Disgust and Hatred." *Mind* 107 (427) 1998: 581-595.
- Korsgaard, Christine. "The General Point of View: Love and Moral Approval in Hume's Ethics." *Hume Studies* 25 (1/2) 1999: 3-41.
- Kramnick, Jonathan Brody. "Rochester and the History of Sexuality." *ELH* 69 (2) 2002: 277-301.
- Kropf, Carl R. "A 'Certain Absence': 'Joseph Andrews' as Affirmation of Heterosexuality." *Studies in the Novel* 20 (1) 1988:16-26.
- LeJacq, Seth Stein. "Buggery's Travels: Royal Navy sodomy on ship and shore in the Long Eighteenth Century." *Journal for Maritime History* 17 (2) 2015: 103-116.
- Lillequist, Jonas. "Peasants against Nature: Crossing the Boundaries between Man and Animal in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Sweden." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1 (3) 1991: 393-423.
- Lloyd, Sarah. "Amour in the Shrubbery: Reading the Detail of English Adultery Trial Publications of the 1780s." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 39 (4) 2006: 421-442.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. "'Pride' in Eighteenth-Century Thought." *Modern Language Notes* 36 (1) 1921: 31-37.
- Luban, Daniel. "Bernard Mandeville as Moralism and Materialist." *History of European Ideas* 41 (7) 2015: 831-57.
- Lutz, Catherine. "Comment on William M. Reddy, Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions." *Current Anthropology* 38 (3) 1997: 345-6.
- Manzer, Robert A. "Hume on Pride and Love of Fame." *Polity* 28 (3) 1996: 333-355.
- Martin, Mike W. "Good Fortune Obligates: Gratitude, Philanthropy, and Colonialism." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* XXXVII (1999): 57- 75.
- Matt, Susan J. "Current Emotion Research in History: Or, Doing History from the Inside Out." *Emotions Research* 3 (1) 2011: 117-124.
- McCarthy, Kieran. "'Peccatum Illud Horribile Christianos Non Nominandum': The Prosecution of Homosexuality in English and Irish Law, 1533-1993" *University College Dublin Law Review* 12 (1) 2012: 1-37.
- McGowan, Randall. "Revisiting the Hanging Tree." *The British Journal of Criminology* 40 (1) 2000: 1-13.
- McIntosh, Mary. "The Homosexual Role" *Social Problems* 16(2) 1968 (Autumn): 182-192.

- McIntyre, Alison. "Fruitless Remorses: Hume's Critique of the Penitential Project of *The Whole Duty of Man*." *Hume Studies* 40 (1) 2016: 143-167.
- McKeon, Michael. "Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28 (3) 1995: 295-322.
- McMaster, Juliet. "The Body Inside the Skin: The Medical Model of Character in the Eighteenth-Century Novel." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 4 (4) 1992: 277-300.
- Miceli, Maria and Cristiano Castelfranchi. "Reconsidering the Differences Between Shame and Guilt." *Europe's Journal of Psychology* 14 (3) 2018: 710-33.
- Micklewright, F.H. Amphlett. "The Bishop of Clogher's Case" *Notes and Queries* 16 (11) 1969: 421-430.
- "Reply" *Note and Queries* 17 (5) 1970: 184-186.
- Molineux, Catherine. "Hogarth's Fashionable Slaves: Moral Corruption in Eighteenth-Century London." *ELH* 72 (2) 2005: 495-520.
- Moloney, Pat. "Savages in the Scottish Enlightenment's History of Desire." *Journal for the History of Sexuality* 14 (3) 2005: 237-265.
- Mosse, George L. "Nationalism and Respectability: Normal and Abnormal Sexuality in the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Contemporary History* 17 (2) 1982: 221-246.
- Muir, Angela Joy. "Courtship, Sex and Poverty: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Wales" *Social History* 43 (1) 2017: 56-80.
- Murray, Julie. "Governing Economic Man: Joanna Bailie's Theatre of Utility." *ELH* 70 (4) 2003: 1043-1065.
- Murrin, John M. "'Things Fearful to Name': Bestiality in Colonial America." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 65 (1998): 8-43.
- Norton, Rictor. "Recovering Gay History from the Old Bailey," *London Journal* 30 (1) 2005: 39-54.
- O'Donnell, Katherine. "'Dear Dicky,' 'Dear Dick,' 'Dear Friend,' 'Dear Shackleton': Edmund Burke's Love for Richard Shackleton." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46 (3) 2006: 619-640.
- O'Flaherty, Niall. "William Paley's Moral Philosophy and the Challenge of Hume: An Enlightenment Debate?" *Modern Intellectual History* 7 (1) 2010: 1-31.
- Oaks, Robert F. "'Things Fearful to Name': Sodomy and Buggery in Seventeenth-Century New England." *Journal of Social History* 12 (2) 1978: 268-281.
- Parreaux, André. "Beckford et Byron." *Études Anglaises* 8 (1955): 11-31.

Pollock, Linda. "Anger and the Negotiation of Relationships in Early Modern England." *Historical Journal* 47 (3) 2004: 567-590.

----- "The Practice of Kindness in Early Modern Elite Society." *Past & Present* 211 (2011): 121-158.

Poole, Steve. "'Bringing Great Shame upon this City': Sodomy, the Courts, and Civic Idiom in Eighteenth-Century Bristol." *Urban History* 34 (1), 2007: 114-126.

Potkay, Adam. "Contested Emotions: Pity and Gratitude from the Stoics to Swift and Wordsworth." *PMLA* 130 (5) 2015: 1332-1346.

----- "Narrative Possibilities of Happiness, Unhappiness, and Joy." *Social Research* 77 (2) 2010: 523-544.

----- "Pity, Gratitude, and the Poor in Rousseau and Adam Smith." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 46 (2017): 163-182.

Radcliffe, Elizabeth S. "Love and Benevolence in Hutcheson's and Hume's Theories of the Passions." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 12 (4) 2004: 631-53.

Reddy, William. "Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions." *Current Anthropology* 38 (3) 1997: 327-351.

----- "Historical Research on the Self and Emotions" *Emotions Review* 1 (4), 2009: 302-315.

Rickless, Samuel Charles. "Hume's Theory of Pity and Malice." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 21 (2) 2013: 324-344.

Robinson, Benedict Scott. "Disgust c.1600." *ELH* 81 (2) 2014: 553-583.

Rodman, Emily. "The Heart in the Archives: Colonial Contestation of Desire and Fear in the New Hebrides, 1933." *Journal of Pacific History* 38 (3) 2003: 291-312.

Rogers, Nicholas. "Carnal Knowledge: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Westminster." *Journal of Social History* 23 (1) 1989: 355-75.

Rollison, David. "Property, Ideology and Popular Culture in a Gloucestershire Village, 1660-1740." *Past and Present* 93 (1981): 70-97.

Roper, Michael. "Between Manliness and Masculinity: The 'War Generation' and the Psychology of Fear in Britain, 1914-1950." *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2) 2005: 343-62.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions." *Passions in Context: International Journal for the History and Theory of Emotions* 1 (1) 2010: 1-33.

----- "Review of William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*." *American Historical Review* 107 (4) 2002: 1181-2.

----- “Worrying about Emotions in History.” *American Historical Review* 107 (3) 2002: 821-845.

Rousseau, George. “The Kiss of Death and a Cabal of Dons: Blackmail and Grooming in Georgian Oxford.” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 21 (4) 2008: 368-396.

Sabl, Andrew. “Noble Infirmary: Love of Fame in Hume.” *Political Theory* 34 (5) 2006: 542-68.

Salice, Alessandro and Alba Montes Sanchez. “Pride, Shame, and Group Identification.” *Frontiers in Psychology* 7 (557) 2016. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00557.

Schauber, Nancy. “Hume on Moral Motivation: It’s Almost Like Being in Love.” *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 16 (3) 1999: 341-66.

Scheff, Thomas J. “Shame and the Social Bond: A Sociological Theory.” *Sociological Theory* 18 (1) 2000: 84-99.

Schrage, Dominik. “The Domestication of Luxury in Social Theory.” *Social Change Review* 10 (2) 2012: 177-93.

Seeman, Erik R. “‘It is Better to Marry Than to Burn’: Anglo-American Attitudes toward Celibacy, 1600-1800.” *Journal of Family History* 24 (4) 1999: 397-419.

Sharrock, Cath. “Reviewing ‘The Spirit of Manhood’: Sodomy, Masturbation, and the Body (Politic) in Eighteenth Century England.” *Textual Practice* 11 (3) 1997: 417-428.

Shaw, Philip. “Longing for Home: Robert Hamilton, Nostalgia and the Emotional Life of the Eighteenth-Century Soldier.” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 39 (1) 2016: 25-40.

Shoemaker, Robert. “The London ‘Mob’ in the Early Eighteenth Century.” *Journal of British Studies* 26 (3) 1987: 273-304.

----- “The Old Bailey Proceedings and the Representation of Crime and Criminal Justice in Eighteenth-Century London.” *Journal of British Studies* 47 (3) 2008: 559-580.

Shweder, Richard A. “Toward a Deep Cultural Psychology of Shame.” *Social Research* 70 (4) 2003: 1109-30.

Silver, Allan. “Friendship in Commercial Society: Eighteenth-Century Social Theory and Modern Sociology.” *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (6) 1990: 1474-1504.

Simpson, Antony E. “The ‘Blackmail Myth’ and the Prosecution of Rape and Its Attempt in 18<sup>th</sup> Century London: The Creation of a Legal Tradition.” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 77 (1) 1986: 101-150.

Skoczylas, Anne. “Archibald Campbell’s ‘Enquiry in the Origin of Moral Virtue’, Presbyterian Orthodoxy, and the Scottish Enlightenment.” *Scottish Historical Review* 87 (223) 2008: 68-100.



- Smith, Hannah and Stephen Taylor. "Hephaestion and Alexander: Lord Hervey, Frederick, Prince of Wales, and the Royal Favourite in England in the 1730s." *English Historical Review* CXXIV (507) 2009: 283- 312.
- Snell, K.D.M. "The Rise of Living Alone and Loneliness in History." *Social History* 42 (1) 2017: 2-28.
- South, Mary L. "Homophobia in Eighteenth Century Southampton." *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archeological Society*. 66 (2011): 187-200.
- Stafford, William. "Concepts of Modesty and Humility in Eighteenth-Century British Discourses." *Enlightenment and Dissent* 29 (Sept. 2014): 42-78.
- Statt, Daniel. "The Case of the Mohocks: Rake Violence in Augustan London." *Social History* 20 (2) 1995: 179-199.
- Stearns, Peter N. and Carol Z. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards." *American Historical Review* 90 (1985): 813-836.
- Stearns, Peter N. "Obedience and Emotion: A Challenge to the Emotional History of Childhood." *Journal of Social History* 47 (3) 2014: 593-611.
- Stephenson, Raymond. "'Epicoene Friendship': Understanding Male Friendship in the Early Eighteenth Century, with some Speculations about Pope." *Eighteenth Century* 38 (2) 1997: 151-170.
- Stoker, David. "The Tailor of Diss: Sodomy and Murder in a Norfolk Market Town." *Factotum* 31 (1990): 18-21.
- Stone, Lawrence. "Libertine Sexuality in Post-Restoration England: Group Sex and Flagellation among the Middling Sort in Norwich in 1706-7." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2 (4) 1992: 511-526.
- Swett, Katharine W. "'The Account Between Us': Honor, Reciprocity and Companionship in Male Friendship in the Later Seventeenth Century." *Albion* 31 (1) 1999: 1-30.
- Taylor, Barbara. "Feminists Versus Gallants: Manners and Morals in Enlightenment Britain." *Representations* 87 (2004): 125-148.
- Taylor, Jacqueline. "Hume on the Dignity of Pride." *Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 10 (1) 2012: 29-49.
- Thompson, E.P. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." *Past & Present* 50 (1971): 76-136.
- Tindermans, Klaas. "Nature, Desire, and the Law: On Libertinism and Early Modern Legal Theory." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 12 (2) 2012: 133-145.

Trumbach, Randolph. "Blackmail for Sodomy in Eighteenth-Century London" *Historical Reflections* 33 (1) 2007: 23-39.

-----"London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century" *Journal of Social History* 11 (1) 1977 (Autumn): 1-33.

-----"Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London", *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2 (2) 1991: 186-203.

Van der Meer, Theo. "Sodomy and Its Discontents: Discourse, Desire, and the Rise of a Same-Sex Proto-Something in the Early Modern Dutch Republic." *Historical Reflections* 33 (1) 2007: 41-67.

Wahrman, Dror. "National Society, Communal Culture: An Argument about the Recent Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain." *Social History* 17 (1) 1992: 43-72.

Walker, A.D.M. "Gratefulness and Gratitude." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 81 (1980/81): 39-55.

Weichel, Eric. "'Fixed by so much better a fire': Wigs and Masculinity in Early 18<sup>th</sup>-Century British Miniatures." *Shift: Queen's Journal of Visual & Material Culture* 1 (2008): 1-25.

White, Jonathan. "A World of Goods? The 'Consumption Turn' and Eighteenth-Century British History." *Cultural and Social History* 3 (1) 2006: 93-104.

Wierzbicka, Anna. "The 'History of Emotions' and the Future of Emotions Research." *Emotions Review* 2 (3) 2010: 269-273.

Williams, Lisa A. and David DeSteno. "Pride: Adaptive Social Emotion or Seventh Sin?" *Psychological Science* 20 (3) 2009: 284-288.

### **Printed Reference Materials**

Ashbee, Henry Spencer. *Index Librorum Prohibitorum: Being Notes bio-, biblio-, iconographical and critical, on curious and uncommon books*. London: Priv. Print., 1877.

Latimer, John. *Annals of Bristol [17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> Century]*. [s.l.]: W. George's Sons, W. & F. Morgan, 1893.

### **Websites**

Dulwich Society. "A Gazetteer of Dulwich Roads and Place Names" 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Published 07 October 2009, updated 15 December 2015.

<https://www.dulwichsociety.com/local-history/465-dulwich-roads-and-place-names>.

Kerr-Jarrett, Andrew. "Family of Frances Newton JARRETT & William CRUCHLEY" [n.d.] Accessed 20 Sept. 2019. [http://orange-tree-valley.co.uk/hnj/rr01/rr01\\_010.htm](http://orange-tree-valley.co.uk/hnj/rr01/rr01_010.htm).

Norton, Rictor. "The Macaroni Club: Homosexual Scandals in 1772." *Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England: A Sourcebook*. 19 December 2004, updated 11 June 2005, updated 13 June 2017, <http://rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/macaroni.htm>.

----- "The Trial of Capt. Edward Rigby, 1698." *Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England: A Sourcebook*. Updated 11 July 2013, <http://www.rictornorton.co.uk/eighteen/rigby.htm>.

## Curriculum Vitae

**Name:** Frances Henry

### Educational Background

- Degree: Ph.D. (History); University of Western Ontario, 2013-2019;
  - Supervisor: Dr. Allyson N. May; Title of Dissertation: Love, Sex, and the Noose: The Emotions of Sodomy in Eighteenth-Century England.
- Degree: Master of Library and Information Studies (MLIS); University of Western Ontario, 2008-2009.
- Degree: M.A. (History); University of Ottawa, 2005-2006;
  - Supervisor: Dr. Mark Jurdjevic; Cognate Title: ‘Hermaphrodites of the Soul’: Sodomy, Homosexuality and Discourse in Renaissance Italy.
- Degree: B.A. (History/Classical Studies), University of Ottawa, 2005.

### Honours and Awards

- 2018-2019: Kenneth Hilborn Memorial Completion Award
- 2016-2018: SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship
- 2016-2017: Ontario Graduate Scholarship (Declined)
- 2016: Kenneth Hilborn Travel Award
- 2015-2016: Ontario Graduate Scholarship
- 2014: Ivie Cornish Memorial Fellowship (for the best Comprehensive Exam marks for that year)
- 2013-2017: Western Graduate Research Scholarship

### Publications

- **Book Reviews**
  - “Making Love: Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature. By Paul Kelleher. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press. 2015. 270 p. \$90 (hb). ISBN: 978-1-61148-694-0” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41 (3) 2018. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12539>
- **Conference Papers:**
  - “The Quality of Mercy is (Definitely) Strained: Lieutenant Robert Jones and the Unchristian Mercy of George III” *Law and Governance in Britain*, Western University, 20-21 October 2017

- “‘The best way to serve an Englishman’: Sodomy and Race on the H.M.S. Africaine, 1815.” *McCaffrey Memorial Seminar Series*, Western University, 10 November 2016.
- “From Buggery to Unnatural Crime: British Newspapers, Sodomy, and the Rise of Politeness”, *McCaffrey Memorial Seminar Series*, Western University, 23 March 2016.
- “‘Imported from Italy, ... the mother and nurse of sodomy’: Xenophobia, Religion and Sodomy in 18<sup>th</sup> Century England” Paper presented at *Prisms, Paradigms and Paradoxes*, 4<sup>th</sup> Annual History Graduate Student Conference, Western University, 1-2 May 2015.
- ‘Of course, we knew she was a man: Princess Seraphina and the Drag culture of 18<sup>th</sup> Century London” Paper presented at *Queer Research Day*, Western University, 16 April 2014.
- “If one chaste love’: Asexuality and the life of Michelangelo Buonarroti”, Paper presented at *Queer Research Day*, Western University, 17 April 2013.
- “Hermaphrodites of the Soul: Discourse and Sodomy in Renaissance Italy.” Paper presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Pierre Savard Conference, University of Ottawa, April 2006.

## Teaching Experience

### • Teaching Assistant

- *University of Western Ontario*: Duties included teaching 2 tutorial sections per course, marking all student writing, assisting in the marking of exams, one-on-one student assistance (when required).
  - *Courses*: Fall/Winter 2016/2017 HIS 2403E: England and Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries.
    - Fall/Winter 2015/2016 HIS 2401E: Medieval Europe
    - Fall/Winter 2014/2015 HIS 2401E: Medieval Europe
    - Fall/Winter 2013/2014: HIS 2403E: England Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Centuries.
- *University of Ottawa*: Duties included marking tests and exams for 80-100 students, one-on-one student assistance (when required).
  - *Courses*: Winter 2006 HIS 2160: Making of the Modern Middle East
    - Fall 2005 HIS 2171: Modern Latin America